LIBRARY OF
Susquehanna University.
SELIN'S GROVE, PA.
Alcove J
Shelf 96
No. 1379

THE

AMERICAN

BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

DEVOTED TO

Biblical and General Literature, Theological Discussion, the History of Theological Opinions, etc.

CONDUCTED

BY ABSALOM PETERS, D. D.

SECOND SERIES.
VOL. THIRD.—NOS. V, VI.—WHOLE NOS. XXXVII, XXXVIII.

NEW-YORK:

PUBLISHED BY WM. R. PETERS, OFFICE OF THE REPOSITORY,
89 NASSAU, CORNER OF FULTON-STREET.

BOSTON:

WHIPPLE & DAMRELL, NO. 9 CORNHILL.

LONDON:

WILEY & PUTNAM, 35 PATERNOSTER ROW.

1840.

Entered according to act of Congress, in the year 1840, by William R. Peters, in the Clerk's Office of the Southern District of New-York.

CONTENTS OF VOL. III.

NO. V.

Page

ART. I. THE PROPER CHARACTER AND FUNCTIONS OF AMERICAN LITERATURE. By Rev. Leonard Bacon, New-Haven, Conn. . 1

ART. II. ON THE DEAD SEA, AND THE DESTRUCTION OF SODOM AND GOMORRAH. By Rev. E. Robinson, D. D. N. York Theol. Sem. 24
Note by the Editor, . . . 24
Letter of Prof. Robinson to M. Leopold Von Buch, . . . 26
M. Von Buch to Prof. Robinson, . 31
Description des Isles Canaries, . 34
The Pitch Lake of the Island of Trinidad, ... 35

ART. III. BAPTISM:—THE IMPORT OF Βαπτίζω. By Rev. Edward Beecher, President of Illinois College, ... 40
Statement of the Case, etc. . 41
False positions and their occasions, 43
The position to be proved, . . 45

ART. IV. ANCIENT AND MODERN ELOQUENCE. By N. Cleaveland, Esq. Newbury, Mass. . . 67
Ancient Eloquence, . . . 67
Modern Eloquence, . . . 76
American Eloquence, . . . 82

ART. V. CHRISTOLOGY OF THE BOOK OF ENOCH; *with Some Account of the Book itself, and Critical Remarks upon it.* By Prof. M. Stuart, Andover, Mass. . . 86
The Discovery of the Book in Abyssinia. 89
Its general Plan, ... 91
A Summary of its Contents, . . 93
Extracts and Remarks, . . . 105
Its Christology, . . . 113, 121
When and by whom written? . 115
Its Quotation by Jude, . . . 134
Its Inferiority to the Gospels, . 137

ART. VI. THE SONSHIP OF CHRIST, AS TAUGHT IN ROM. 1: 3, 4. By Rev. Lewis Mayer, D. D. York, Pa. 138
Import of the terms *flesh and Spirit of holiness*, ... 139
The Union of the Man Jesus Christ with the Logos, ... 145
Note by the Editor, . . . 166

Page

The true interpretation of the Text 172

ART. VII. REMARKS ON "AN ESSAY ON CAUSE AND EFFECT, IN CONNECTION WITH FATALISM AND FREE AGENCY," AM. BIB. REPOS. Oct. 1839. By Rev. Leonard Woods, D. D., Andover, Mass. 174

ART. VIII. REVIEW OF THE MEMOIR OF MRS. SARAH LANMAN SMITH. By Rev. N. Adams, Boston, Ms. 194

ART. IX. CRITICAL NOTICES.
1. Bush's Notes on Genesis, . 227
2. The Comprehensive Commentary, ... 229
3. Jahn's Archæology, Translated by Upham, . . . 232
4. Gulielmi Gesenii Thesaurus, . 232
5. Die Heilige Schrift des Alten und Neuen Testaments, . 233
6. Olshausen's Last Days of the Saviour, ... 233
7. Xenophon's Memorabilia of Socrates, ... 234
8. Chalmers' Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, . 234
9. Adams' Exposition of 2 Peter, 235
10. Greenhill's Exposition of Ezekiel, ... 236
11. Winer's Grammar of Greek Idioms, ... 238
12. Anderson's Address at South Hadley, ... 239
13. Smith on the relation of Scripture and Geology, . . 241
14. Davidson's Biblical Criticism, 243
15. Job and his Times; by Wemyss, ... 245
16. Morison's Parents' Friend, . 246
17. The Massachusetts School Library, ... 247
18. Harpers' School District Library, ... 249
19. Ramshorn's Latin Synonymes, ... 252
20. Dana's Letters to Stuart, . 253
21. Schmucker's Appeal on Christian Union, ... 254
22. Sprague's Memoir of Dr. Griffin, ... 255
23. Dupin's Trial of Jesus, . . 255
24. Turnbull on the Theatre, . 256

ADDITIONAL NOTICES. . . . 256

NO. VI.

Page

ART. I. RELIGIOUS PREJUDICES. By Pres. Philip Lindsley, D. D. Nashville, Ten. 257

ART. II. THE COMPARATIVE MORAL PURITY OF ANCIENT AND MODERN LITERATURE. By Prof. E. D. Sanborn, Dartmouth College, N. H. 281

ART. III. THE LAND OF GOSHEN AND THE EXODUS OF THE ISRAELITES. By Rev. Prof. E. Robinson, D.D. New-York Theol. Sem. . . 306
Land of Goshen, ... 316
Route of the Israelites, . . . 318
Passage of the Red Sea, . . 320

ART. IV. ON THE GEOLOGY OF PALESTINE, AND THE DESTRUCTION OF SODOM AND GOMORRAH. By Prof. Charles A. Lee, M. D., New York, ... 324
Geology of Palestine, . . . 325
The Dead Sea, ... 332

ART. V. BAPTISM :—THE IMPORT OF Βαπτιζω, (Concluded.) By Rev. Pres. E. Beecher, Jacksonville College, Ill. 352

ART. VI. HISTORICAL SKETCH OF DEISM. By Rev. Prof. Enoch Pond, D. D., Bangor Theol. Sem. Me. 372

ART. VII. THE RELIGIOUS CHARACTER OF A NATION THE ELEMENT OF ITS PROSPERITY. By Rev. George Duffield, Detroit, Mich. 384

ART. VIII. THE PRESENT STATE OF THE JEWISH RELIGION. By E. S. Calman, Missionary to the Jews in Palestine, . . . 398
Introductory Note by the Editor, . 398
Rev. E. Smith's account of Mr. Calman, ... 399
Mr. Herschell's State of the Jews 400

ART. IX. SOME OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PRESENT AGE, 426

ART. X. INQUIRIES RESPECTING FREE AGENCY, ... 455

ART. XI. REMARKS ON AN ARTICLE DENOMINATED CAMPBELLISM, BY REV. R. W. LANDIS. AM. BIB. REPOSITORY JAN. AND APRIL, 1839. By A. Campbell, Bethany, Va. . . . . .

ART. XII. CRITICAL NOTICES, . 503
1. Barnes' Notes on Isaiah, . 503
2. Eschenburg's Manual of Classical Literature, translated by Prof. Fiske, . . 505
3. Coleridge's Aids to Reflection, 506
4. A new work on Christian Antiquities, . . . 509
5. Lee's Geology of the U. S. . 510

ART. XIII. RECENT LITERARY INTELLIGENCE, ... 512
Germany, ... 512
France, ... 514
United States, ... 514

CONTENTS OF NO. V.

Page

ART. I. THE PROPER CHARACTER AND FUNCTIONS OF AMERICAN LITERATURE 1

By Rev. Leonard Bacon, New-Haven, Conn.

II. ON THE DEAD SEA, AND THE DESTRUCTION OF SODOM AND GOMORRAH 24

By Rev. E. Robinson, D. D. New York Theol. Sem.

Note by the Editor 24
Letter of Prof. Robinson to M. Leopold Von Buch 26
M. Von Buch to Prof. Robinson 31
Description des Isles Canaries 34
The Pitch Lake of the Island of Trinidad . . 36

III. BAPTISM :—THE IMPORT OF *Βαπτιζω* 40

By Rev. Edward Beecher, President of Illinois College.

Statement of the Case, etc. 41
False positions and their occasions 43
The position to be proved 45

IV. ANCIENT AND MODERN ELOQUENCE 67

By N. Cleaveland, Esq. Newbury, Mass

Ancient Eloquence 67
Modern Eloquence 76
American Eloquence 82

V. CHRISTOLOGY OF THE BOOK OF ENOCH; *with Some Account of the Book itself, and Critical Remarks upon it* 86

By Prof. M. Stuart, Andover, Mass.

The Discovery of the Book in Abyssinia . . . 89
Its general Plan 91
A Summary of its Contents 93
Extracts and Remarks 105
Its Christology 113,121
When and by whom written? 115
Its Quotation by Jude 134
Its Inferiority to the Gospels 137

VI. The Sonship of Christ, as taught in Rom. 1: 3, 4 138
By Rev. Lewis Mayer, D. D. York, Pa.

Import of the terms *flesh and Spirit of holiness* 139
The Union of the Man Jesus Christ with the Logos 145
Note by the Editor 166
The True Interpretation of the Text 172

VII. Remarks on "An Essay on Cause and Effect, in connection with Fatalism and Free Agency," Am. Bib. Repos. Oct. 1839 174
By Rev. Leonard Woods, D. D., Andover, Mass.

VIII. Review of the Memoir of Mrs. Sarah Lanman Smith 194
By Rev. N. Adams, Boston, Mass.

IX. Critical Notices.

1. Bush's Notes on Genesis 227
2. The Comprehensive Commentary 229
3. Jahn's Archæology, Translated by Upham . 232
4. Gulielmi Gesenii Thesaurus 232
5. Die Heilige Schrift des Alten und Neuen Testaments 233
6. Olshausen's Last Days of the Saviour . . 233
7. Xenophon's Memorabilia of Socrates . . 234
8. Chalmer's Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans 234
9. Adams' Exposition of 2 Peter 235
10. Greenhill's Exposition of Ezekiel 236
11. Winer's Grammar of Greek Idioms . . . 238
12. Anderson's Address at S. Hadley 239
13. Smith on the relation of Scripture and Geology 241
14. Davidson's Biblical Criticism 243
15. Job and his Times: by Wemyss 245
16. Morison's Parent's Friend 246
17. The Massachusetts School Library . . . 247
18. Harper's School District Library 249
19. Ramshorn's Latin Synonymes 252
20. Dana's Letters to Stuart 253
21. Schmucker's Appeal on Christian Union . 254
22. Sprague's Memoir of Dr. Griffin 255
23. Dupin's Trial of Jesus 255
24. Turnbull on the Theatre 256

Additional Notices 256

THE

AMERICAN

BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

JANUARY, 1840.

SECOND SERIES, NO. V.—WHOLE NO. XXXVII.

ARTICLE I.

The Proper Character and Functions of American Literature.

By Rev. Leonard Bacon, Pastor of the First Church, New-Haven, Conn.

The subject proposed for this article may seem at first like one of the common-places of magazine essays and anniversary orations. Yet I am persuaded that the views which have suggested themselves to me in thinking of this theme, if not new, are at least worthy of a renewed consideration.

Ever since I can remember, American literature has been inquired after, and inquired about, in all quarters. It has been debated whether there is any such thing, and if so, what are its merits—whether any such thing is likely to be, and if so, what it will be. The first of these questions is a question not of fact, nor even of speculation, but only of words. We have no national epic, no body of national dramatic poetry; and in this view of the matter, surely, we have no American literature. But we have books of American production, and these books have readers, and the number of such books and their readers is continually increasing; and in this sense there can be no dispute that American literature has already begun to exist. Thus far, however, it cannot be denied that the books written in this country, with some few distinguished exceptions, should be

considered rather as American contributions to the common literature of the English language, than as constituting even the germ of such a body of letters as shall reflect the national spirit and re-act for salutary ends upon the national mind.

I have announced then, without intending it, what I conceive to be the proper character and functions of American literature. In all its forms of history, philosophy, poetry, eloquence, its peculiar character must be that it breathes and manifests the national spirit; and its one great function must be to re-act for salutary ends, upon the national mind from which it emanates. It must be essentially shaped and informed by the peculiar spirit of the American people, or it will always be a failure, a faint and cheap imitation of foreign models. However voluminous, however elaborate or elegant, may be the literature produced by writers born upon our soil, if it be not American in its tone and spirit, in the cast of its ideas and sentiments, it will always be to the American people as essentially foreign as translations from the French or German are to the people of Great Britain. Being thus deficient in the life and power of an original literature sprung from the soil, and intertwined with all the associations and habits of the people, it can have no sway over the heart of the people; it will have no aim; it will perform no part in history. And on the other hand, whenever literature in this country becomes conscious of the dignity of its function, and grapples in earnest with the national mind to lead it, to elevate it, to control it for worthy ends, it will immediately and without an effort, adapt itself to the people; it will reflect of course, I do not say the opinions, but the intellectual habits, the sentiments, the peculiar character of those to whom it addresses itself.

This view let us attempt to develop. What is, and is to be, the peculiar national character with which American literature must harmonize, and upon which it ought to act, purifying and elevating the national mind?

The character of a people, so far as it depends on other than geographical causes, such as climate, soil, sea-coast, rivers, mountains, and extent of territory,—is determined mostly by its origin, its history, its political organization, and its religious doctrines and institutions. These various influences are not only blended in the result, but are continually acting upon each other. The origin of a people, the blood of which it springs, affects all its history, more surely and

more powerfully than parentage affects the destiny of the individual. The history of a people determines its political organization, and its political organization in turn modifies the chances and changes of its history. Religion too exerts its strongest and steadiest influence upon a people, when it is blended with their historical recollections, when it has brought their laws and all the order of their civil state into harmony with itself; and on the other hand the character of a people, as determined by political and historical influences, has much to do in moulding the forms of religious doctrine and directing the spirit of religious institutions. Any one of these causes, then, completely understood, will indicate with more or less exactness, what must be the peculiarities of the national character, and what ought to be the genius of the national literature.

For our present purpose, then, it may be sufficient to keep in mind the peculiar structure of society and of government in this country, and to ask what sort of a literature, breathing the national spirit, and elevating the national character, ought to grow up in a country thus organized?

In pursuing this inquiry, my first position is, that there will be no place in American literature for certain sentiments, either entirely factitious or unnatural in their development, which, originating in the feudal structure of society, have had great influence upon the literature of Europe.

Take, for example, the sentiment of loyalty. We in this country know not what it is; we can hardly conceive of it but by a strong effort of imagination. Yet it is a sentiment so familiar to most Englishmen, that the absence of it from our common character as a people, puzzles and perplexes many an English traveller more than any thing else. Loyalty is a strictly feudal sentiment, the feeling of attachment to a feudal superior — a feeling like that with which a Highlander looks on the hereditary chieftain of his clan—the feeling with which a faithful vassal followed his superior to war, without ever a thought about the reason of the quarrel in which his all was perilled—the feeling with which a hearty Englishman naturally regards his lawful sovereign. The feeling is indeed continually decaying in most countries of Europe, but it is still vigorous under every old and stable government, and it is not extinct even where revolution, like a deluge, has swept away the ancient landmarks. In the old world, it outlives the feudalism in which it originated,

and lingers—"the melancholy ghost of dead renown"—haunting with its shadowy presence the ivied castles and decaying tombs of the system to which it once gave life and beauty. But in this new world, it has never been naturalized. What do we know of the sentiment with which the whole Prussian people rose at the long expected opportunity, and rushed upon the French in grief and rage, to avenge, not so much their own wrongs, as the wrongs which Napoleon had inflicted upon their king, reducing him to vassalage, and the insults which he had heaped upon their queen—wrongs and insults which had sent her broken hearted to the grave. Not long before the death of that high-minded but unhappy queen, when the clouds hung darkest around the royal house of Hohenzollern, she said, "Posterity will not set down my name among those of celebrated women, but whoever knows the calamities of these times, will say of me, she suffered much, and she suffered with constancy: may he be able to add, she gave birth to children who deserved better days, who struggled to bring them round, and at length succeeded." We can feel the eloquence of this, because every word of it comes from a suffering human heart, and strikes upon our human sympathies, but what do we know of the thrill with which the recital of these words, at the time, went through every loyal Prussian heart? What do we know of the peculiar tone of sentiment with which that whole people, arming at last for the avenging conflict, made the name of their dead queen—Louisa—their war-cry,—or of the grief, which, when their valor had restored their widowed king to his due rank and independence as a sovereign, saddened their triumph with the thought, "She has not lived to see it."

This sentiment of loyalty, in its various forms and relations, controls to a great extent the manners of Europe, and is every where in that old world one of the constituent elements of national character. It is therefore, in this connection, worth looking at a little more distinctly. Loyalty towards a sovereign is not simply the feeling of respect towards a chief magistrate, whose person represents for the time being the law and the state. Woe to our commonwealths when that feeling shall be unknown among us. The English shout, or song, "God save the King!" is uttered in a different note from the huzzas with which the butt-enders of the New York democracy greet their favorite president. Respect

for a chief magistrate must be combined with another element, before it becomes loyalty. You must feel that the chief magistrate is something more than a magistrate – that he is your sovereign – that you belong to him as his subject, so that he has a property in you—that he is your protector and lord, the fountain of power, justice, and honor, – and then you know what loyalty is, towards a sovereign. Does any body in England, save perhaps some speculative democrat, ever think of the young lady in Buckingham palace as simply a female chief magistrate? Or does the true Englishman think of her rather as his royal mistress, and as having a personal right in him which she has inherited, and which is to descend like any other property to her heirs? In something of the same spirit, do the peasantry on a great estate look up to their immediate superior. He is the proprietor of the soil which they cultivate; he is, or ought to be, their hereditary guardian and patron; they are not his slaves indeed, but they are in one sense a part of his property; all the fruit of their toil, beyond a meagre supply of comforts for themselves, is his; if he is benevolent and conscientiously bent on the improvement of their condition, they are happy; if he cares not for them, they can do little for themselves. So much of the feudal system remains, that the feeling of dependence and inferiority on the one hand, and of superiority and power on the other, runs through society. That radical element of the feudal system, the principle of the lower made for the higher, the many for the one, the cultivators of the soil for the proprietors of the soil, the peasantry for the aristocracy, the people for the sovereign,--is not yet extinct even in legislation. Far less is it extinct in respect to its influence on manners and national character. Feudalism, in its various modifications, is the grand element in the *history* of every European people; and therefore its influence cannot but be for ages to come one of the grand elements in the *character* of every European people. The constitution of society, even in the freest countries there, is still feudalism at the foundation. The feudalism is reformed indeed, remodeled, broken up and reconstructed with large additions of new materials: securities are provided for human rights; guards are erected against the abuse of power; the great principle has been forced in, that though the many are made for the one, the one on the other hand is made for the many, and owes them duties as sacred as the duties

which they owe to him; but with all these reforms, and with all this infusion of liberty and justice, the peculiar sentiments which the old system engendered, remain; and among them the most obvious, and to us the most unknown, is the sentiment of loyalty to the sovereign, with its kindred sentiment of loyalty to rank.

Another sentiment which has great influence on national character in all the countries of European Christendom, is the pride of birth. This, in its rudiment, is a natural sentiment; and as such it must have some place and influence under every structure of society. We are not ignorant of the manifestations of this natural sentiment. Every man who had an honest father and a virtuous mother, feels the impulse of this sentiment, and knows why it was implanted in his nature. Every man who respects his own name because his father bore it before him—every man who feels himself quickened in the path of honor or of virtue by the necessity of not dishonoring the blood of which he was begotten—every man who feels that the reputation of his father is involved in his own, and that the dear memory of his mother is to be honored by his virtues and achievements, or disgraced by his meanness, is conscious of that natural sentiment which in other circumstances is exaggerated into pride of birth.

Hereditary distinctions and honors, then, are not to be denounced as intrinsically absurd, or contrary to the common sense of human nature. It is natural to think the better of a man for being the worthy son of an illustrious sire. The renown of ancestors is and ought ever to be a part of the possessions of their children. The question whether the principle of hereditary distinctions shall be incorporated with the political institutions of a people, or whether the sentiment of respect for parentage shall be left to work simply by its own power, as one of the elements of human nature, is a question to be determined more by experience than by any abstract reasoning. The only inquiries ought to be, What does experience teach? Where the principle of hereditary rank is established, what is its effect on national character and the general welfare? How does it bear upon the grand result—the greatest happiness of the greatest number? Does it operate most effectually to excite effort and stimulate virtuous aspirations, or more to repress exertion and to produce stagnation in all classes? In our country, guided as we

think by the long experience of mankind, we have rejected from our political structure all hereditary honors, all distinctions founded upon parentage. The children of the pauper and the felon stand, before the law, upon the same platform of equality with the children of the most illustrious benefactor of his country or of his race. No man is punished for his father's misdoings; no man is rewarded with public honors for his father's achievements. This, I doubt not, is as wise, considered in reference to its political bearings, as it is right in morals. With us, the advantages to be derived from the most illustrious parentage, are simply those which the law of nature gives without any factitious enlargement.

How contrary to this was the structure of feudal society. Under that system, every thing was hereditary. Every man's station in society was determined by his birth; and exceptions were made, only as the strata were disturbed by frequent violence. He who was born a noble, was held to be made of finer clay, tempered with a more etherial spirit, than he who was born a peasant. The influence of this old habit of thought remains in all the countries where feudalism once reigned. The system in which such a habit of thought originated, is every where passing away, if not already destroyed; but its influence in this respect still lives. In all the freer countries of Europe, and most of all perhaps in Britain, many an avenue is open by which genius and worth may rise even from the humblest walks to eminence and honor: but still the influence of old hereditary distinctions hardly begins to be effaced from the common mind. There the greatest success, the greatest honor, is to rise to the level of the old feudal aristocracy. The orator in the House of Commons, whose eloquence adorns and enriches his mother tongue—the patriot statesman, whose skill guides his country through the storm—the jurist whose genius and industry have thrown light along the Gothic labyrinths of the law—the warrior whose exploits, on the deep or on the land, have made "the meteor flag of England" burn more terrific than before—mounts at last to the peerage, and thus attains the goal of his ambition. And what an ambition! He is a peer indeed; but he comes a *novus homo* into the circle of the old nobility. He is a peer indeed, and is permitted to uphold the rotten aristocracy, by bringing to its aid the vigor of his talents and the lustre of his performances; but after all, the stupid descendant of some

iron-fisted, leaden-headed old baron of the days of King John,—the coroneted gambler "whose blood has crept through" titled "scoundrels ever since" it was ennobled by the Tudors,—yes and the rowdy profligate who traces his pedigree back to some unmentionable female in the court of Charles the Second,—takes precedence of him, and blesses himself as of a more illustrious birth than this new created lord of yesterday. Meanwhile, the man of science and of letters has no hope of rising to so glorious an eminence. The astronomer who writes his name among the constellations—the chemist at whose analizing touch nature gives up her profoundest secrets—the inventor who gives new arms to labor, new wings to commerce, and new wealth and comforts to mankind—the historian who illuminates his country's annals, and turns into wisdom the experience of past ages—the poet who entrances nations with the spell of song and fable—seeks the *patronage* of the high-born, happy to share that patronage with actors and Italian fiddlers, thrice happy if the king, deeming him fit to stand in the outer court of aristocracy, shall dub him knight, or exalt him to the rank of baronet. Thus Davy, transformed into Sir Humphrey, or Brewster, elevated into Sir David, is made equal in rank with such samples of human nature as Sir Mulberry Hawk; even as Newton after having revealed the system of the universe, and having made his simple plebeian name the most illustrious in the history of human knowledge, was belittled into Sir Isaac, and enabled to stand in the court of Queen Anne at the same degree of greatness with Pope's

> "Sir Plume, of amber snuff-box justly vain,
> And the nice conduct of a clouded cane."

Thus "the Aristo of the North," after having filled the world with his fame, received the honor of a baronetcy, and was made almost respectable enough to be company for such as the high-born earl of Munster, and the noble marquis of Waterford. Thus perhaps, if Milton were to come to life again, under the present whig administration, and were so far to divest himself of his old Puritan and republican whims, as to make himself agreeable to my Lord Melbourne, we might hear of Sir John Milton, the author of Paradise Lost.

This sentiment then, the feudal sentiment of pride of birth, is in Great Britain, and far more in most European

countries, one of the elements of national character. It works not only in those who have high birth to be proud of, but in those who feel themselves depressed because others were born so far above them. It affects not only the etiquette of the palace and of the princely castle, but the manners and feelings of society in each of its numerous gradations. You may see the reflection of its influences direct and indirect, upon all the volumes even of the current literature of the old world.

Inseparable from this in its influence on society, is another feudal exaggeration of a natural human sentiment. As the pride of birth, which we have been considering, is the perversion of that human affection which connects us with our ancestors, so family ambition is the perversion of that human affection which connects us with our posterity. The pride of being born of a great family, and the ambition to be the founder or upbuilder of a great family are only modifications of the same disposition. Great families are a part of the feudal system. The estate of a landed proprietor under that system, is of the nature of a subordinate principality. Hence the undivided transmission of estates to the eldest son. Hence the law of entail, by which the estate is inalienable, the possessor for the time being having only a life interest in it. These two principles working together make great families. In our country, happily, great families are impossible. We see indeed, now and then, something of the European ambition to make a great family; for the impossibility is not yet so fully understood as to produce its complete effect upon the sentiments and habits of the entire people. Now and then we see a man who has acquired wealth by skill and diligence in business—or more often one who has suddenly grown rich by the chances of speculation—and who, having seen or heard how the aristocracy of Europe live in feudal grandeur on their great estates, on which their ancestors have lived for ages before them, and on which their descendants are to live through ages yet uncounted,—is ambitious to do something of the same kind here, to call his lands after his own name, and to build the baronial mansion which his posterity shall inhabit. But the great estate is divided; each heir, trained in the same luxurious habits as if he were to inherit the whole, finds his fragment insufficient for his wants; the domain passes into the hands of strangers; the aristocratic mansion becomes

perhaps a tavern, perhaps a manufactory. The experiment soon becomes ludicrous, for till the laws which control inheritance and the tenure of estates—laws more fundamental to our social system than any others, and more deeply engraved upon the hearts of the people—are radically changed, the attempt must be as futile as an attempt to change the order of the seasons. All that a man can do for his posterity, under our laws, aside from what he does for the common welfare of his country—he must do by training his own children, so that they shall train theirs, for virtue, and for that wealth which is in the mind and not in outward possessions. In feudal countries, on the other hand, and in Britain as much as in any other, the moment a man begins to rise from poverty itself, the moment his accumulations begin to put him in any sense beyond the reach of personal want, one of his first temptations is to look out for his family; not merely to secure his children against poverty, but to raise his remote posterity into an elevated rank, to separate their interests from the interests of society at large, and thus to spread out his selfishness over all future time. The effect of this on national character cannot be insignificant. Look at such a man as Walter Scott fired with this family ambition, and under the impulse selling himself to a drudgery that broke his mighty energies, and exhausted those powers that had so long seemed exhaustless, and all for what? Why, that the author of Marmion and of Ivanhoe might be as Carlyle has well expressed it, "the founder of a race of Scotch lairds."

With the sentiments already noticed, and with the structure of society which engenders them, the sentiment of contempt for labor and for poverty is inseparably connected. Where society is thus divided into classes by hereditary distinctions—one class created to possess, to enjoy, to govern, to be honored, and another class destined to obtain by toil a scanty subsistence, or in more fortunate instances a humble competency,—labor is of course dishonored. There those who are born to labor feel that their lot is degradation, they are made to feel it by all the arrangements of society. Human nature every where, and under all political institutions is prone enough to despise labor, and to honor as the favorites of fortune or of Providence those who have nothing to do; but in the state of society of which we are speaking, that propensity instead of being counteracted, as the author

of our nature designed it should be, is pampered to a monstrous growth. Man was made for employment, made to provide for himself, and to enjoy what he has the more for itsbeing the fruit of his industry; and that constitution of society only is in accordance with the constitution of individual man, in which each individual has scope for the exercise of his powers, and is stimulated to a wholesome activity. Society is not yet so constituted in the old world; though by successive changes it is continually approximating towards such a constitution. Meanwhile the old contempt for labor remains, acting and re-acting between the two great classes into which society is divided,—the mere consumers despising the producers, and the producers therefore despising themselves,—the unproductive consumers blessing themselves as the favorites of heaven, and the producers, on the other hand, envying the consumers and ever learning to hate them.

In our own country, different sorts of labor are of course held in different degrees of honor. Those employments which require high intellectual and moral qualifications, cannot but be regarded among us as more honorable than mere muscular drudgery; for it is naturally presumed that the man is furnished with those personal qualities which are necessary in his employment. Still, with us, no sort of honest labor is dishonorable. Our country has thousands of legislators and magistrates who cultivate their own acres with their own hands, and who think none the less of themselves on that account, and are none the less thought of by their fellow citizens. But under other systems, the different kinds of labor, instead of being more or less honorable, are only more or less dishonorable. Where the highest class is supposed to find its honor and its felicity in doing nothing, there the necessity of earning one's bread in order to eat it, is a dishonor, a mark of inferiority; and each particular kind of labor is higher or lower on the scale of respectability, not in proportion to the demand which it makes for a higher or lower order of qualifications, but in proportion as it brings men nearer to the level, and secures for them the patronage or the deference, of the unlaboring aristocracy. Even in the middle ages the man of science or of letters, the physician, the learned clerk, the skilful artizan, could command from peer and king something of the respect due to intellectual and personal superiority, but still the superiority of knowledge and of virtue, was as nothing before the great-

ness of hereditary wealth and power. As civilization advances, the aristocratic class becomes more educated, and seeks to ally itself more closely with the intellectual class. Thus the dignity of idleness is placed side by side with the dignity of intellectual power, till by degrees men begin to see the difference. And while idleness is thus insensibly losing its exclusive honors, industry itself begins to be delivered from its reproach; for knowledge is continually spreading wider and lower among the laboring classes; and political power is passing, sometimes by gradual reform, and anon by the convulsive shock of revolution, from the few to the many. But ages must yet elapse before the effects of the old order of things shall be effaced from the manners and from the opinions and feelings of the whole people.

I have not forgotten that there are causes at work in our own country, to degrade the true nobility of labor. I have not forgotten the ambition of some to import the ideas and to ape the habits of European life. This however, though aided by the constant circulation of English "tales of fashionable life," and of other things in the same style, can have but little efficacy in counteracting the tendency of the great facts of our condition. The fact that here the cultivators of the soil are the lords of the soil, will stand in spite of Blackwood's Magazine and Bulwer's novels, and in spite of the endeavors of here and there a rich man to make himself unhappy by living in the state and pomp of aristocratic laziness. And so in spite of all such influences, the fact will stand, that here all political power is in the hands of those who live by industry; and that other fact that the few who *can* live without labor are too few and too scattered to constitute a class, and that of them not one in five is willing to live without some active and useful employment. Nor have I forgotten that, by a mournful anomaly in the political organization of some portions of our country—an anomaly contradictory of all the principles and tendencies of the American civilization—labor is, in those localities, dishonorable; and if I were compelled to believe that such an anomaly will be permanent upon the American soil, outliving or subduing the various influences with which it is at war, I never should have thought of speculating, but with shame, upon the probable character and functions of American literature. That anomaly must pass away; or all that brightens and adorns this land with the promise of a new era of freedom

for mankind, must perish before it, and society itself must be constructed upon other principles than those which are now recognized as its foundation,—yes, upon principles more preposterous than monarchy, and more barbarous than feudalism. The American structure of society must predominate here to the exclusion of every hostile element, or its very foundations must be subverted. The soil of freedom must be cultivated by the hands of freemen, or the time will come when from each traditionary hill, and from each sacred battle field, the voices of the guardian genii, will be heard in tones of grief, "Let us depart." Where is the man, calling himself an American, who does not in his heart believe that this dark anomaly will pass away; and that the time will come, when no spot in our vast union shall be profaned by a fettered step, or by the stroke of an unwilling hand, but every where jocund labor shall look up to heaven in the conscious nobleness of perfect freedom.

The feudal sentiment of honor, has had great influence on the literature of Europe from the romantic ages to this hour. Ancient literature bears no trace of such a sentiment. The sense of right and wrong, the love of reputation, and a quick sensitiveness to the good or ill esteem of others, are common to mankind, and are most developed where human nature is most elevated by intellectual and moral culture; but the feudal sentiment of honor, which tinges all modern literature, is something different from these. What is called the *law* of honor, is the most distinct and tangible manifestation of the feudal sentiment which has produced it. You could not make Cicero, or Cæsar, or Brutus, or Mark Antony, or the heroic Scipio understand the law of honor, even in its first principles—you could not make Pericles, or Epaminondas, with his "two immortal daughters," or Achilles *iracundus et acer*, understand it—any more than you could make Moses or Abraham understand it. It is a code made not for men as men, nor for men as citizens, nor for men as fathers, husbands, brothers, neighbors, friends; it is a code for gentlemen only, for men of birth, men of a certain feudal rank; if peasants or mechanics undertake to apply it, they only make themselves objects of ridicule. The sentiment of honor, as embodied in the law of honor, is not simply the feeling which revolts from doing what the wise and the good disapprove; a man may be covered thick with vices, he may be a drunkard, he may be a gambler, he may be a

brawler in the streets, and the disturber of a congregation met for peaceful worship, he may abuse the wife of his bosom, he may be the seducer and betrayer of female innocence, he may be a murderer, and still be a flourishing specimen of the sentiment of honor; for none of these things prove him to be a churl, a peasant, a base mechanic, —none of them are inconsistent with his gentle birth and nurture. The sentiment of honor, as embodied in the law of honor, is not simply the fierce impulse of revenge for injuries,—of injuries as such it takes no direct cognizance; it is the state of mind which feels a particular sort of insult from a particular sort of insulter, with a morbid sensitiveness, and which seeks to wipe away that insult not by mere vengeance, but by vengeance obtained through a particular process—a process the absurdity of which, as estimated by any rule of reason, or by any unsophisticated human feeling, is beyond expression. This is feudal honor, an arbitrary conventional sentiment appropriated to a particular high-bred class, and which the peasantry, the vulgar, have no right to be acquainted with. Such a sentiment could not have originated under any system but that of the middle ages; it cannot be perpetuated in a community, where all are politically equal, and where all the institutions of society tend to make the man more honorable than the gentleman.

You need not tell me that the law of honor reigns with a bloody sway in some parts of our country. I know it; and every man knows that if you inclose in lines upon the map of the United States, that region where the code of honor is recognised, you enclose just that region in which American institutions and American principles have not yet done their work. I mean nothing which ought to offend any man's honest sensibilities; for where are we to look for the true operation, the demonstrated tendency of the American structure of society? In one part of the country, this peculiar structure of society, built on the theory of equal rights, has existed without material change for more than two centuries. In another part of the country, the present order of things, so far as it is the same, dates no farther back, at the farthest, than the Declaration of Independence, and began even then amid embarrassments and counteracting influences which have not yet been removed. Where shall we look to ascertain the real tendency of the American civilization? At Plymouth? Or at Pensacola? I do not say that the man

of Pensacola is to be blamed, or the man of Plymouth to be lauded, for the difference. They stand at two different points, on the broad stream of history. Travel over all those parts of the country, where the counties are divided into towns, and the towns into school districts, each town and each school district managing its own affairs; and where the soil, meted out into farms, is cultivated by the hands of its possessors; and where the votes that determine who shall be selectmen, and who shall go to Congress, and who shall be governor, are deposited in the ballot boxes by the hard huge hands of those who till the ground or strike at the anvil—in this organization you will see the American order of things. Tell me whether the law of feudal honor can be anything but a perishing exotic, under such institutions.

For these sentiments, then, which originated in the feudal structure of society, and which give a peculiar coloring to all the literature of Europe, there will ultimately be no place in the American character, and therefore there will be no place for them in the literature of the American people, when once it shall have been formed in harmony with that character and shall re-act upon it for salutary ends. In this country, above all others, "the age of chivalry is gone:" and the age of the people has succeeded, the age of utility and justice, of common rights and common sense. Literature, among us, must speak with a different tone from that which she learned at feudal courts and tournaments, or she will ever seem to speak with an ungraceful, because outlandish accent.

It is still more obvious that our literature whenever it shall meet our actual sentiments and wants as a people, must be rich in the illustration of certain civic and social virtues, for which there was but little scope under the now antiquated institutions of Europe. To explain what I mean by this position, let me just name to you some of the virtues which are essential to the well-working of such institutions as ours, and which may naturally be looked for under such institutions, but which are hardly expected to exist in other forms of society.

Patriotism, then, is the most obvious of these virtues, not the mere sentiment of attachment to one's native soil, but the intelligent and hearty love of country, prompting to thought and effort for the country's welfare. This is the

virtue of a freeman. Who expects the slave to love the country which will not own him for a man? The serf trodden into the soil, with nothing to lose or to gain by the vicissitudes of empire—who expects him to care for any interest out of his own cabin? Patriotism is the virtue of a citizen, a member of the commonwealth, not of a mere subject. The whole political duty of a mere subject, whether under a monarchy or an oligarchy, is summed up in silent obedience. Where society is divided into orders, patriotism in the lower orders is a dangerous affair—dangerous to themselves—dangerous to the state,—eminently dangerous to the established system. Hence though Europe has had patriot kings, and patriot nobles and statesmen; we hear of a patriot peasantry there, only in connection with tumult and arms. Patriotism among the people, is, in the old world, another name for revolution; the faintest whisper of it "with fear of change perplexes monarchs." But with us, patriotism is an every day duty for every man. Every man, not dead to virtue, loves his country with a manly affection—thinks, reasons, inquires, acts for his country's welfare. He loves his country as the virtuous sovereign loves his kingdom, because it is his own, because its destinies are in a degree entrusted to his hands. His pride of ancestry, is not that he is born of better blood than his countrymen, but that he is born of the same blood with the men of "the heroic age," the men of Bunkerhill, of Bennington, and of Yorktown. His hopes, too, for his posterity, are all patriotic, not personal. His hopes for them are identical with his hopes for his country. That strong impulse which leads all men to care for their posterity in coming ages, leads him to care that these equal laws, this well ordered liberty, this universal diffusion of knowledge, these purifying and sustaining influences of Christian truth, may be perpetual.

A peculiar regard for law is another republican virtue. In Europe there is a reverence for power, which secures obedience to the expression of the sovereign will. The government there is a great power, and the people are its subjects. Crimes are offences not against the people, but against this great power at the metropolis. When a crime has been committed, popular sympathy, if awakened, is as likely to take the part of the criminal as of the law. The whole affair, from the commission of the crime to the infliction of the penalty, is a sort of conflict between the offender

and the government, in which the spectators have little concern except as they naturally feel some compassion for the weaker party. How different is it where the government is the organ, and the law the expression, of the popular reason and the popular will. Every citizen has an interest in the law and in the administration of it; and the consequence is that when a crime has been committed, every citizen feels it as a wrong done to himself, every eye is awake to discover the criminal, and every hand is ready to aid in arresting him. Now and then there is indeed—though less frequently than in other countries—some outbreak of popular passion. There is a riot in the streets of some city, or a daring piece of mischief by the lewd fellows of the baser sort in some village—such as in old England would hardly be noticed as any thing extraordinary. At once a thousand voices cry out, that the laws are dishonored, and the ark of freedom is taken. Some petty offence, through the delinquency of a petty magistrate, or some graver crime, through the perverseness of a jury, escapes due retribution, and at once a thousand voices are lifted up in solemn indignation. It is our national sensitiveness to the sacred dignity of law, our deep conviction of the indispensableness of law to freedom, which makes us so ready, on every occasion, to tremble lest our freedom end in anarchy. It is a salutary fear, and whenever and wherever the public mind is unconscious of that fear, then and there, is danger for our country.

Public spirit is another of these republican virtues This is a sort of local patriotism. It is the spirit which moves the inhabitants of a town or city, a particular district or locality, to plans and efforts for their own common good. It provides a city with commodious avenues, with public squares and walks and groves. It endows institutions for the promotion of knowledge, the library, the lyceum, the university. It decorates the place with stately edifices for public use,—churches, school-houses, halls of justice. It raises the spire, the monumental column, the honorary statue. It pours along the crowded haunts of human life pure water from the mountains, a stream of health and comfort. So in a village, it keeps the rural sanctuary and school house neat and trim. It encloses the green with its white railing. It roots out the briers from the place of graves, and plants the trees that are to throw their solemn shade upon that tranquil spot. It exerts itself to keep the highways and bridges in repair, and

to have good schools for all the children. In a larger district it operates on similar objects. It marks out those lines of communication which shall make intercourse most easy and rapid. Here it opens a new road, or straightens an old one; there, it connects rivers by a canal; and on another line, it constructs a railway. Here it sets up an academy; there it builds a college. Public spirit is at work with various degrees of vigor, of wisdom and of steadiness, all over the country, for all sorts of objects. The structure of society takes it for granted that there will be public spirit every where, and every where it is infusing public spirit into the popular mind. The people are all trained to the habit of taking care for their own common concerns. Not only the nation collectively, and each state separately, but each county, each town, each school district, is to provide for its own common interests. In what country upon earth, can you find so many myriads of minds continually on the alert to see how the public may be better accommodated?

If I may be allowed to name another of the civic virtues necessary to the well being of our form of society, it is frugality and simplicity of manners. In all countries not republican, the government is of course confounded with the individuals who administer it, or rather those individuals *are* the government. All the magnificence of the state is simply the personal magnificence of the sovereign. The sovereign is to be magnificent in all his expenditures. Frugality in a king—simplicity of style and manners in a king—it is not respectable. The palace must glitter with gold, and the crown must flash with gems, or the whole concern is shabby. Personal magnificence then being necessary for the sovereign, it is of course necessary in its degree for those higher orders in society who approach the throne in station and in power. Besides, in that unnatural distribution of wealth which characterizes all European countries, frugality and simplicity of manners, however necessary and becoming in the poor, is a very doubtful virtue in the aristocracy. In addition to its being vulgar, it is of doubtful popularity. The aristocracy are the spending class, one of their functions is to spend what the toil of the peasantry produces; and ought not they to spend profusely? With us, on the other hand, none but a fool, or one whose head is turned by too sudden or too high an elevation, can confound the government with the men who administer it. Here the magnificence of the

great federal republic is one thing, and the magnificence of the great men of the republic is another thing. The capitol; the public offices, the national ships, the arsenals, the custom houses in great cities—let them be magnificent; they belong to the Union, and the magnificence of the Union is becoming. But the personal magnificence of the President, and of those who aspire to the Presidency—the personal equipage, the luxury and pomp of senators and heads of departments and executive functionaries,—is entirely out of keeping, and the good sense of the people revolts at it. That functionary trusted with millions of the public treasure, whose legal revenues from his office, might with frugality and simplicity, endow him with the power of becoming an honored and happy benefactor of his country, if he undertakes to be magnificent,—becomes a defaulter, and flees from his country's wrath into infamous exile. That statesman who forgetting such models as Franklin and Sherman, is touched with the vulgar ambition of princely style and splendor, will find that no American revenue is equal to such ambition; and however illustrious he may be with the gifts of nature and the fruits of his own studious toil, though his eloquence transcend the fame of Tully and rival that of Demosthenes, though he be the glory of the forum and of the senate, and applauding thousands catch each echo of his voice, he will find in time that to squander with princely magnificence, is to lose the highest favor, not of the rabble, but of the people.

Here then you see in part what American literature must be in its character and in its functions, whenever it shall be truly American. It must be marked with the impress, and alive with the spirit, of these manly republican virtues. One of its great duties must be to cherish such virtues, to keep them alive and active in the popular mind, that they may grow with the nation's growth, and strengthen themselves from age to age, the ever brightening tokens of the nation's immortality.

Another sort of influence, peculiar as yet in a great degree to our own country, will have much to do in determining both the proper character and the proper functions of our national literature. In other ages and lands, the man of letters has had his patrons, in whose favor he has lived, and whom his grateful verse or prose has immortalized. Literature has been for a particular class—for the imperial Augustus, for the munificent Pollio, for the noble Mecænas

atavis editus regibus. Here on the other hand, if it becomes really national, it will be not for a noble class, not for a reigning class, but for the one class, the people. When the American system of society shall have been perfected, and the whole population shall have been trained under its influences, the whole population will be a reading population —a population to be moved and charmed by poetry, to be enlightened and elevated by history, to be taught, argued with, persuaded, respecting their interests, their rights, and their duties. Then how many millions upon millions of readers will constitute that public to which American literature shall address itself. Perhaps, among the readers of this page, there is the poet-boy, "mute and inglorious" as yet, who, like Milton, "long choosing and beginning late," shall by and by utter those words of living song which shall at once be echoed from the waters of the Oregon, and who in a green old age shall be crowned with the laurel offered in the acclamations of more than forty millions of his countrymen. What will that literature be which shall teach the hearts, and sway the minds of such a public? Will it have anything in it, of the nature of intellectual dandyism? Will it have any affinity with that which seeks the exclusive patronage of an imaginary higher class, the courtly, the idle, the fashionable, the first circles? Would you see some intimation of what it is likely to be? Look not for those books which are printed only to be bound in satin covers, and to lie with undimmed gilt edges upon tables of marble and rose-wood, but for those which naturally make their way every where alike, and which are not only talked of in circles of literary pretension but are read without criticism at the farmer's kitchen fireside. Where will you not find that book about the "Rich Poor Man" and "Uncle Phil," and the meek sufferer Charlotte — thumbed, worn, blistered perhaps with natural tears?

One glance at another view of our subject, and I have done. Can there be a truly American literature which shall not be eminently controlled and enlivened by the spirit of the Christian religion? Some superficial observers have an idea that the tendencies of our system of society are all to irreligion, to unmingled worldliness, to blank infidelity. Elsewhere, the existing forms and institutions of religion are in close alliance with the existing forms of government; and consequently, just as fast and as far as the public mind moves

towards political revolution, there is danger of its casting away, not only religious corruptions and abuses, but the very name of Christianity. The inference has been hastily made, that here, where a new organization of society is in full operation, religious faith must of course have ceased to be an element in society. English tories and English radicals, with opposite motives, are apt to concur in the hasty conclusion. And some unthinking, unobserving minds on this side of the Atlantic, themselves unconscious of the expansive and ennobling power of Christian truth, seem really to have taken it for granted that religion is no part of the American character; that faith in God and in the retributions of the eternal state, faith in the Bible, and faith in Jesus Christ, are never to be spoken of, except as they occur in certain decent forms and observances, and never to be thought of, except perhaps at a funeral. Is it so? Because we have no hierarchy allied with a mighty aristocracy, and both supporting the throne that supports them - because worship and religious instruction are not regulated by the government—have we therefore ceased to be a Christian people? That philosophic traveller, whose work on "the Democracy in America," is the ablest exposition of the American civilization, ever produced by a foreigner—perhaps I ought to add, abler than any that has yet been produced from among ourselves—carried back to the old world no such report. His deliberate testimony is, "There is no country in the whole world, in which the Christian religion retains a greater influence over the souls of men than in America; and," he adds like a true philosopher, "there can be no greater proof of its utility, and of its conformity to human nature, than that its influence is most powerfully felt over the most enlightened and free nation of the earth." "If any hold," says he, "that the religious spirit which I admire, is the very thing most amiss in America, and that the only element wanting to the freedom and happiness of the human race is to believe in some blind cosmogony or to assert with Cabanis the secretion of thought by the brain, I can only reply that those who hold this language have never been in America, and that they have never seen a religious or a free nation. When they return from their expedition we shall hear what they have to say." "How is it possible," he exclaims, "that society should escape destruction, if the moral tie be not strengthened in proportion as the political tie is

relaxed? and what can be done with a people which is its own master, if it be not submissive to the Divinity?"

Is not this a true report? Is not religion, the religion of the Christian Scriptures, one of the grand elements in the character of the American people?—nay is it not the first of the constituent forces of the American civilization? How can it be otherwise? Is not our whole history brightened with peculiar and glorious manifestations of the power of religious faith? Can the American people cast away their Christian faith, without tearing themselves from the past, and dishonoring all that endears and hallows the names of their own ancestry? Is religion with us a mere dying tradition—a merely lingering respect for ancient forms and prejudices? What! when of all the reading of the people three-fourths is purely religious!—when of all the issues from the press, three fourths are theological, ethical, and devotional!—when the spontaneous offerings of the people are planting churches, and rearing temples, and training an educated clergy, and endowing and multiplying seats of Christian learning, and putting the Bible into every family, faster than could be done by the utmost exertion of imperial power!—when the American people are at this moment pursuing the enterprise of spreading Christianity through the world, with a zeal less blazing indeed than that of the crusades, but more inflexibly determined, because more deliberate, more enlightened, and more conscientious!—when on every side it is conceded and reiterated that moral force, not physical, must guard us against ruin; that sound moral influences, religious affections and sympathies, confidence in God, and the sense of Divine accountability, diffused through the nation, must be our only safety! No!

> "The pilgrim spirit is not dead,
> It walks in the noon's broad light,
> And it watches the bed of the glorious dead,
> With the holy stars at night."

Can there be, then, a literature truly and thoroughly American, which shall not be as thoroughly Christian? How can it be national, unless it shall proceed from the religious soul of the nation, and shall breathe the pure spirit of Christian faith? It must ever drink not of any fabled fountain of merely earthly inspiration, but of

> "Siloa's brook that flows
> Fast by the oracle of God."

What then is the conclusion of the whole matter?

First, American literature will never be formed by the mere imitation of English models. Those who are ambitious to please and instruct their countrymen by writings which their countrymen shall honor, will never succeed by trying to catch the tone and ape the manner of English fugitive literature. If our countrymen want English literature, it is cheaper, easier, and in every respect a far better bargain, to get the original article than to get the imitation.

Next, a truly American literature will never be created, till literature ceases to be a merely elegant amusement, and addresses itself in earnest to the subjects that take strong hold of the interests and affections of the American people. I have heard of a parish somewhere, who were delighted with their minister, and thought him the most unexceptionable man in the world, because, as they said, he never introduced into his discourses either politics or religion. Literature framed upon such a principle, will always be despised by a free, a grave, and active nation.

My last word is, that American literature must be the product of free, enlightened, honest minds, kindling with the spontaneous fires of genius and of love. Affectation of sentiment is as powerless as the affectation of genius. Writers destitute of religious sentiment at the heart, but affecting to infuse into their works the sentiment of Christian faith out of deference to public opinion, will never strike that chord in the hearts of the people which vibrates to the touch of truth. So the affectation of Americanism—and above all the affectation of hyper-democracy—will ever overshoot its mark, exposing its own unworthiness. The affectation of whatever sentiment, religious or political, is a base and conscious slavery of the soul. Let the young scholar, then, whose mind is fired with the hope of by and by delighting and instructing his countrymen, beware of affectation. Remember, he who speaks to a free people must himself be free—free within—conscious himself, and making others conscious, that his emotions and his faculties are all his own.

ARTICLE II.

On the Dead Sea, and the Destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.

By Rev. Edward Robinson, D. D., Prof. Orient. Lit., Theol. Sem., New York.

*To the Editor of the Biblical Repository.**

Sir,

In travelling in May, 1838, along the shores of the Dead Sea, with my friend, the Rev. E. Smith, our attention was naturally directed, not only to the singular natural phenomena connected with that sea; but also to the history and circumstances of the dread events, which Scripture has recorded as having taken place within the deep valley which it now occupies. We had become aware, that the former theory that the Jordan's having once flowed through this plain and the great southern valley to the Red Sea, was no longer tenable; and the still earlier one of a subterranean lake covered with a stratum of asphaltum and earth, on which stood the cities of the plain, seemed the mere vagary of a mind not well informed. We spoke upon the subject and felt that all former theories respecting the destruction of those cities must be abandoned; although we did not feel ourselves able at the moment to propose a new one, we became aware, however, that the cities must probably have

* This communication, with the accompanying article was designed for the October No. of the Repository, but came to hand too late to be inserted at that date. The facts and suggestions which it contains are highly important to the cause of natural science as well as of Biblical learning. We hope to follow it, in subsequent Nos. of our work, with articles from the same author on topics of equal interest and value. An article is expected for our next, (if it should not arrive in season for insertion in the present No.,) on the *Passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, with Notices of the land of Goshen, etc.* These sketches by one who has visited the scenes of the Scripture miracles, and who is so well qualified to describe them, cannot fail to be read with interest.

To some of our readers it may not be known that Dr. Robinson is still in Europe, where he has been engaged since his

stood in the southern part of the plain or valley now occupied by, or adjacent to the sea. We supposed too, that their catastrophe must have had some connexion with the pits of asphaltum (slime-pits, Gen. 14: 10,) which before existed in the valley; and that the southern part of the sea, beyond the peninsula, might probably have been in some way occasioned by this conflagration. But the main body of the sea, further north, we thought must have been already in existence; since it exhibits no evidence of any later origin, than the Lake of Tiberias in the same great valley.

Our attention was soon engaged with other objects equally interesting; and we left this subject without arriving further at any very definite conclusions. During the course of the last winter, Mr. Smith being then in Leipzig, I had occasion again to take up the same inquiry: and pursuing it further arrived at a theory which may perhaps, in some of its points, be the true one. Its main features were these: The sea anciently extended only so far South as to the peninsula; south of this were the pits of asphaltum, around which extensive strata of the bitumen had spread themselves out over the surface of the valley; upon this bitumen a stratum of soil had been formed, which was fertile and well-watered, and on this stood the cities. The Lord, by means of lightning or fire from heaven, caused the strata of bitumen to be set on fire, which then burnt with a fury sufficient to destroy the cities, consume the strata forming the fertile surface of the valley, and thus in parts sink its level; so that a portion became covered by the waters of the sea rushing in, while

---

return from Palestine, in the diligent preparation of the researches of himself and Mr. Smith, in the Holy Land, for publication. The work has been principally written at Berlin, with the best advantages, and, as is expected, will be published in London, and in this country, under the superintendence of the author. In the mean time a Translation has been made into German, which will be simultaneously published in Halle, under the supervision of Prof. Roediger, a distinguished Oriental scholar. These publications will be accompanied with a new and improved map of Palestine prepared from the notes of Messrs. Robinson and Smith by a distinguished and scientific artist. Great interest is manifested in this work by men of the highest name and character for Biblical and Geographical learning in Germany and England. We trust its publication will not be long delayed. Editor.

the rest remained a salt and dreary desert, as it is at this day. Within the new portion thus occupied by the sea, the fountains of asphaltum may be supposed to be still at work beneath the water, producing the occasional phenomena of that substance for which the sea is famous.

My own impressions in respect to the above theory may be gathered from the following letter to M. De Buch. As I am no geologist, it seemed to me preferable, so far as I am concerned, to arrange the facts we had collected and lay them before scientific men, rather than build up theories in a department which is not my own. In this way, and out of these views, arose the correspondence which is here subjoined. It is hardly necessary for me to say, that M. de Buch, the distinguished geologist who was so good as to reply to my inquiries, holds the highest rank in this department on the continent of Europe; and that he has paid more attention than any man living to the phenomena of volcanoes and volcanic action.

I wish it to be distinctly understood, that the question here, on my part, has reference solely to the *means* which the Almighty employed for the miraculous destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. I propose no theory on the subject; nor does M. de Buch; but my object is to present facts and materials, of which others may make use, in order to carry out the discussion further. For this reason I have subjoined an extract respecting the volcanic 'dyke' found near the island of Banda in A. D. 1820; and another containing an account of the very remarkable Pitch Lake in the island of Trinidad. This last presents an analogy to what may have been the ancient character of the asphaltum around the pits in the valley, before the destruction of the cities of the plain.

I should be highly gratified if Prof. Silliman, or Prof. Hitchcock, or others of our American geologists, would look at the subject, and lay the result of their reflections before the public. Yours in Christian bonds,

Berlin, July 25, 1839. Edward Robinson.

I. *Prof. E. Robinson to M. Leopold von Buch.*

Berlin, April 17*th*, 1839.

Sir,

In accordance with your kind permission, I venture to throw together a few hints and notices respecting the region

around the Dead Sea and its phenomena, in the hope of being able, through your suggestions, to arrive perhaps at some explanation founded on scientific principles, of the historical notices of this district contained in the Scriptures.

Our journeyings led us twice to the borders of the Dead Sea. Once, passing down from near Hebron (el-Khûlil,) we struck it at 'Ain Jiddi; and proceeded along its western side to Jericho. The second time, we went from Hebron to near the *ford* marked on most modern maps; and thence to the southern point; and so through the Ghôr and Wady el-'Arabah to Wady Mûsa. We found the Sea here occupying the whole breadth of the great valley, which extends from Jebel esh-Sheikh and Banias to the Red Sea al 'Akabah; but the mountains do not open out into a circle or oval around it, as is usually represented; that, at both the northern and southern ends of the Sea, that and the valley are somewhat contracted by promontories running out obliquely from the western mountain; and that all the southern extremity, is a long even ridge, unconnected with the western mountains and lying in front of them, running along the shore S. S. E. from near the said ford to the end of the sea. It then bends to the S. S. W. for about the same distance, where it terminates. The height of this ridge is 150 to 200 feet; and the mass of it is *fossil salt*, thinly covered with strata of limestone and marle. South of this ridge the Ghôr is again wider. But about eight or ten geographical miles (60 to a degree) distant from the sea in the same direction, is a line of cliffs apparently stretching across the whole Ghôr, as if cutting off all further progress southward. At the foot of these are many brackish springs, which at present form a marsh along their base. These cliffs, however, proved to be nothing more than an offset or step between the Ghôr below, and the higher level of the valley further south, which from that point takes the name of Wady el-'Arabah. Through these cliffs or offset, consisting of marle, the deep water-course of the great valley breaks its way down to the level of the Ghôr, between banks 150 to 200 feet high. It is called Wady el-'Jeill, a Wady within a Wady. This water course was dry when we saw it in June; but in the rainy season it drains off the waters of el-'Arabah and of the adjacent mountains and high deserts on either side, and carries them *northward to the dead sea*. Its bed has a rapid descent, and bears marks of a large and powerful volume of water. It

begins, as we learned from Arabs of that region, beyond Wady Ghûrûndel, or nearly three quarters of the distance towards 'Akabah; the water-shed being so indistinct as not to have been remarked by travellers who have passed over it. The waters of Wady Ghûrûndel itself flow off northwards. The waters of the great western *plateau*, or the desert el-Tih, as far south at least as the point opposite 'Akabah, and probably much further, also flow northwards along the *plateau*, being drained off by the Wady Jerâfeh, which runs north and enters el-'Arabah nearly opposite to Wady Mûsa. The great valley as seen from 'Akabah looking northwards, appears to have only a slight acclivity, and exhibits scarcely a trace of a water course. The whole conformation of this valley, thus presenting a much longer and greater descent towards the south, seems of itself to indicate, that the Dead Sea must lie considerably lower than the Gulf of 'Akabah.

It has been generally assumed that the Dead Sea has existed only since the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah recorded in the book of Genesis; and the favorite hypothesis of late years has been, that the Jordan before that time flowed through Wady el'Arabah to the Gulf of 'Akabah, leaving the present bed of the Dead Sea a fertile plain. But this, as is now known, cannot have been the case; at least not within the times to which history reaches back. Every circumstance goes to show, that a lake must have existed in this place, into which the Jordan poured its waters before the catastrophe of Sodom. It seems also a necessary conclusion, that these cities lay to the southward of the lake; for Lot fled to Zoar which *was near* to Sodom; and Zoar lay almost at the southern end of the present Sea, (the name having still existed in the time of Abulfeda in the 14th century,) apparently at the mouth of a Wady coming down from Kerak in the eastern mountain. The fertile plain, therefore, which Lot chose for himself, and which was well-watered like the land of Egypt, lay also south of the lake and near to Zoar, (Gen. xiii. 10—12.) And to the present day more living streams (not less than four or five) flow into the Ghôr at the south end of the Sea from the eastern mountain, than are to be found so near together in all Palestine; and the tract is better watered still, than any other district throughout the whole country. In that plain too were *wells* or pits *of asphaltum* (חֵמָר) the same word used in describing Babylon, and indicating the same substance as that with which the

walls of that city were cemented, (Gen. xiv. 10, compared with Gen. xi. 3.) The valley indeed in which these pits were, is called Siddim ; but it is said to have been near the salt Sea and contained Sodom and Gomorrah. (Gen. xiv. 3, 10, 11)—The streams that watered the plain remain to attest the accuracy of the historian ; but the pits of asphaltum are no longer to be seen. Did they disappear in consequence of the catastrophe of the plain?

The southern part of the Dead Sea has a singular configuration. About three hours north of the southern extremity, the broad low neck of a peninsula runs out from the eastern shore terminated by a long bank at right angles to the neck, like a long narrow island or sand bank running from north to south. This bank is perhaps nearer to the western than to the eastern shore ; and the peninsula may be said almost to divide the sea. (There is a trace of this peninsula on the maps of Berghaus and others ; though it is always too small, and has not by any means the true form.) At the southern point of this long bank, the Sea, which is here hardly wider than a broad river, sweeps round to the east and south-east, and forms a bay, which constitutes the southern part or end of the Sea, and is in general very shallow. The adjacent shore on the south, is low and flat ; and when the lake is swollen by winter rains, the water sets up over it two or three miles farther south than when we saw it. The limit of this overflowing was very distinct ; being marked by trunks of palm-trees and other drift-wood. Indeed the whole southern part of the Sea, as seen from the western mountains, resembled much a long winding bay, or the estuary of a large river, when the tide is out and the shores left dry.

We travelled with Arabs of different tribes, inhabiting both the northern and southern parts of the western coast ; and our guides were the most intelligent Sheikhs of those tribes. We inquired often and particularly respecting the phenomena of asphaltum in this Sea ; and received a uniform answer from all, "they had never known of its being found except in the Sea ; nor there, except after earthquakes. After the earthquake of 1834, a considerable quantity was found floating in small pieces, which were driven on shore and gathered. After the great earthquake of Jan. 1, 1837, (in which Safed was destroyed,) a large mass of asphaltum was found

floating in the water,—one said "like a house," another, "like an island,"—to which the Arabs swam off, and cut it up with axes, and gathered enough to sell for more than 500 Spanish dollars. In both cases, the asphaltum was found in the southern part of the Sea. One Sheikh, a man fifty years old, who had spent his life here, said he had never seen asphaltum, or known of its being found, at any other time. The Arabs all *supposed*, that it collects upon the rocks of the eastern shore, and being broken off, falls into the Sea; but they did not agree as to the place where this was supposed to occur.

In view of these facts, which were observed or collected by ourselves upon the spot, I would respectfully suggest the following inquiries:

1. May we perhaps regard the lake as having anciently extended no farther south than the peninsula; near which there were the asphaltum-pits, and further south the fertile well-watered plain?

2. Is it allowable to suppose, that either by a conflagration of the asphaltum in the pits, or by some volcanic action, the soil of this plain (with the cities) might be destroyed, and its level lowered; so that the waters of the lake would rush in, and thus form the present southern bay? Might perhaps the asphaltum have previously collected into a mass or stratum round about the pits, and have become so covered or mixed with soil, as to form a fertile tract, which was then destroyed by conflagration? Or further, might we perhaps conceive, that in combination with some such cause, the bottom of the sea might be heaved up by volcanic action, so as to raise the level of the waters, and cause them to overflow a large tract?

3. Is there perhaps good reason for supposing, that these pits or fountains of asphaltum may still exist under the waters of the lake; and that the asphaltum, becoming hard through the action or contact of the water, remains fixed in the orifices of the fountains until dislodged by some shock like that of an earthquake? If, as is reported, asphaltum were anciently more abundant in the lake than at present, this might perhaps be accounted for, by supposing it not to have been usually gathered and carried away.

I might go on and suggest many other inquiries; but these perhaps are sufficient for the purpose in view. For any

suggestions which you may make relative to these or other kindred topics, I shall feel myself under the most grateful obligations.

With high consideration
Yours, etc.
(Signed) E. ROBINSON.

P. S. I forgot to say that small lumps of sulphur are found in many places along the shores of the sea.

II. *M. Von Buch to Prof. E. Robinson.**

Berlin, 20th April, 1839.

Monsieur,

C'est plutôt pour répondre à l'honorable confiance que vous voulez avoir en moi, que dans l'espérance de pouvoir vous faire une observation digne de vous être répresentée, que je vous adresse ces lignes.

La vallée du Jourdain est *une crévasse*, qui s'étend depuis le Liban jusqu' à la Mer Rouge sans interruption. Voilà, à ce qui me semble, le resultat de vos récherches comme de celles de M. le Comte Bertou et M. Callier, qui malgré ce fait en veulent à M. Ritter pour avoir dit la même chose. Ces longues crévasses, fréquentes surtout dans les montagnes calcaires, donnent la configuration à nos continents. Si elles sont très larges et profondes, elles donnent

* For the convenience of such of our readers as may not understand the French language, we give below a translation of this letter of M. de Buch. [Ed.

Translation.

Sir,

It is rather with a view of responding to the confidence with which you are pleased to honor me, than under the expectation of being able to present you any observations worthy of your attention, that I transmit you these lines.

The valley of the Jordan is a *fissure*, extending uninterruptedly from the Libanus to the Red Sea. This is the result to which your own investigations lead, as do also those of Count Bertou and Mr. Ritter, who notwithstanding found fault with Mr. Callier for having affirmed the same thing. These long fissures, which are of frequent occurrence, especially amongst calcareous mountains, give rise to the configuration of our continents. When of great size and depth, they afford

passage aux montagnes primitives, qui par celle raison forment des *chaines*, dans une direction, que la crévasse leur a prescrite. On peut donc s'attendre à un plus grand developpement des agens volcaniques au fond de cette crévasse, que sur les hauteurs.

Le sel gemme est, d'après les recherches les plus récentes, un produit d'une action volcanique ou plutanique le long d'une ouverture de cette nature. Mais, les sources d' asphalte ou de bitume le sont aussi ; comme le prouvent la quantité de sources de bitume depuis le pied du Zagros aux environs de Bassorah jusqu'à Mosul et à Bakou ; comme le prouvent encore le source de bitume dans le golfe de Naples, ou à Mellitti près de Siracuse ; comme le prouvent les sources de bitume sur l'isle de Zante, et même le bitume de Seyssel dont on fait les trottoirs à Paris.

L'Asphalte de la Mer Morte n'est vrais-semblablement que le bitume consolidé au fond du lac, qui ne peut pas s'écouler, et forme par conséquent une couche sur ce fond, comme à l'isle de Trinidad. Il est assez vrais-semblable, que celle accumulation se soit faite dans les temps reculés, comme de nos jours ; et si des actions volcaniques, une elevation du terrain, et des tremblements de terre ont mis au jour des

---

egress to the primitive mountains, which accordingly form *chains* in the direction prescribed to them by the fissure. We may therefore look for a greater development of volcanic agencies at the bottom of such fissures than on the highlands.

Fossil salt, according to the most recent researches, is a product of volcanic or plutonic action along an opening of this description. That springs of asphaltum or bitumen, however, originate in the same manner, is proved by the number of them which exist in the tract of country extending from the foot of the Zagrus in the neighborbood of Bassora as far as Mosul, and at Bakou, by the one in the bay of Naples and at Melliti near Syracuse, and also by those of Zante ; to which may be added the bitumen of Seyssel, of which the footpaths of Paris are constructed.

The asphaltum of the Dead Sea is probably nothing more than the bitumen consolidated at the bottom of the lake, which being unable to flow off, forms there a bed, as is the case in the island of Trinidad. It is altogether probable that this accumulation took place in ancient times as in our own day ; and if volcanic actions, the upheaving of the soil, and earthquakes, have brought to light, masses of asphaltum analogous

masses d'asphalte analogues à celles que vous avez decrite (phénomène de la plus haute importance, inconnue jusqu'ici,) on peut très bien concevoir la conflagration de cités entières par l'inflammation de matières si éminement combustibles.

Si on pouvait decouvrir quelque masse basaltique dans la partie ou méridionale ou vers l'extremité sud de la Mer Morte, on pouvait croire, qu'un "dyke" basaltique se soit fait jour lors de la celébre catastrophe, comme cela est arrivé en 1820 près de l'isle de Banda et au pied du volcan de Ternate, (Descript. Phys. des Isles Banains. p. 112.) Les mouvements qui accompagnent la sortie d'un tel "dyke" sont bien en état de produire tous les phénomènes qui ont changé cette contrée interressante, sans éxercer une influence très marquée sur la forme et la configuration des montagnes à l'entour.

La fertilité du sel dépend quelquefois de très légers accidents. Il n'est pas probable que le bitume soit propre pours l'augmenter. Mais il est bien possible, que les mouvements du terrain ont pu mettre au jour une plus grande masse de sel gemme, entrainée par les eaux vers le fond de la vallée; ce qui suffisait pour lui ôter sa productibilité. Le sel gemme n'aurait pas tant frappé Lot, pour l'imaginer que sa femme eut été changée en sel, si l'on avait eu con-

---

to those you have described (a phenomenon of the highest importance and hitherto unknown), we can easily conceive the conflagration of entire cities in consequence of the taking fire of materials so excessively combustible.

If a mass of basalt could be discovered in the southern part or towards the southern extremity of the Dead Sea, we might suppose that a basaltic dyke had made its appearance at the celebrated catastrophe, as occurred in 1820 near the island of Banda and also at the foot of the volcano of Ternati. The movements attending the eruption of such a dyke would be well calculated to produce all the phenomena which have changed the face of this interesting country, without exercising a very marked influence on the figure and conformation of the surrounding mountains.

The fertility of the soil sometimes depends on very trifling circumstances. It is not probable that bitumen is calculated to augment it; but it is very possible that the movements of the earth may have expelled a greater mass of fossil salt, afterwards drawn by the water towards the bottom of the valley, which would suffice to destroy its productiveness. The fossil salt would not so have struck Lot as to make him

naissance de son existence entre les couches de la montagne avant le catastrophe mémorable.

Il faut espérer que la Societé Géologique de Londres, si active, voudra bien un jour envoyer un de ses membres pour éclairer avec le flambeau de la Géologie des faits qui intéressent tout le monde. Mais il faudrait rechercher toute la constitution géologique et du Liban et de toute la vallée du Jourdain depuis Tiberias jusqu'à Akaba.

Je conçois, Monsieur, que tout ceci doit peu vous contenter. Mais je pense qu'il est téméraire de se faire une théorie sur des faits dont on n'a pas du moins observé soi-même les résultats.

J'ai l'honneur d'être avec la plus haute consideration,

Monsieur,

votre tres humble et obeissant,

(Signé:) LEOPOLD DE BUCH.

III. *Extract from the Work: Description des Isles Canaries etc. par L. de Buch.* P. 412. Paris, 1836.*

L'isle de Banda avait auparavant une grande baie sur la côte occidentale: en 1820, après que l'eruption se fut terminée, il se fit dans la mer un soulèvement; et une masse solide,

---

imagine that his wife had been turned into salt, if its existence between the strata of the mountains had been known previous to the memorable catastrophe.

It is to be hoped that the Geological Society of London, which is so active in its exertions, will one day send one of its members to illuminate with the torch of geology facts that are interesting to all the world. In so doing it would be necessary to investigate the geological structure of the Libanus and of the entire valley of the Jordan from Tiberias to Akaba.

I suspect, sir, that this will prove to you far from satisfactory; but I consider it rash to form a theory on facts of which one has not been able at least to observe for one's self the results. I have the honor to be, &c.,

(Signed,) LEOPOLD DE BUCH.

* Translation.

The island of Banda had formerly a large bay on its eastern side. In 1820, when the eruption was at an end, the sea became agitated, and there arose a solid mass composed of large blocks

composée de gros blocs semblables à du basalte, vint non seulement remplir et combler cette baie dont la profondeur etait 60 brasses mais elle forma même, au dessus de la mer, des collines très élevées et fort étendues, qui entourent le pied du volcan, et s'appuient contre les flancs de cette montagne.

Aucune des matieres qui composent cette masse soulevée, n'a été fondue ou coulante ; tous les blocs étaient crevassés, et degageaient d'abondantes vapeurs, mais ce soulèvement n'a rejeté ni rapilles, ni cendres, ni pierre-ponces. Les habitants de Banda, dont les maisons se trouvent sur le revers opposé, ne s'apercurent de ce phénomène remarquable, qu'après que la plus grande partie de ce soulevement se fut effectué, et lorsqu'ils en eurent été avertis par les vapeurs et par l'echauffement des eaux de la mer. Lorsque M. Reinwardts visita et examina cette localité en 1821, des vapeurs d'eau et de soufre se degageaient encore entre ces blocs entassés. Le môle élevé au milieu de la baie, est formé de couches très épaisses, qui sont inclinés des deux cotés, et dont le milieu au cime est recourbée en dôme. Les couches inferieures sont tout-a-fait compactes ; les couches superieures, au contraire, sont poreuses (*Boon-mesch*, p. 88,) Il semble que ce soit la répétition des effects du soulevement

---

resembling basalt, that not only filled up this bay, whose depth was sixty fathoms, but also formed above the level of the sea very high and extensive hills, which surround the base of the volcano, and rest against the sides of this mountain.

None of the substances composing this elevated mass were in a fluid state. All the blocks contained fissures and disengaged vapors in abundance ; but the eruption threw out neither rapils, cinders, nor pumice-stones. The inhabitants of Banda, whose dwellings are situated on the opposite side, did not perceive this phenomenon until the greater part of the eruption had been completed, when they became apprised of it by the vapors and the warmth of the sea-water. When Mr. Reinwardts visited and examined the locality, in 1831, steam and sulphurous vapours were still thrown off from the coacervated blocks. The mole raised in the middle of the bay is formed of very thick strata, sloping down to either shore and rounded at the summit in the form of a dome. The lower strata are extremely compact, while the upper ones on the contrary are porous. This appears to be a further effect of the raising of the cone itself of a volcano ; from which occurrence one may

du cône même d'un volcan, et par cet évenément on peut se faire une idée de la possibilité de l'elévation des grandes masses solides qui ont produit les obélisques d' Auvergne, et les murs basaltiques saillants qui terminent les filons de basalte.

IV. *Extract from a Paper on "the Pitch Lake of the Island of Trinidad," by N. Nugent, M. D., Transactions of the Royal Geological Society, London*, 1811, *vol.* 1. *p.* 63.

Being desirous to visit the celebrated Lake of Pitch, previously to my departure from the Island of Trinidad, I embarked with that intention in the month of October, 1807, in a small vessel at Port Spain. After a pleasant sail of about thirty miles down the Gulph of Paria, we arrived at the point la Braye, so called by the French from its characteristic feature. It is a considerable headland, about eighty feet above the level of the sea, and perhaps two miles long and two broad. We landed on the southern side of the point, at the plantation of Mr. Vessigny. We ascended the hill, which was entirely composed of porcelain-jasper rock, to the plantation, where we procured a negro guide, who conducted us through a wood about three quarters of a mile. We now perceived a strong sulphurous and pitchy smell, like that of burning coal, and soon after had a view of the lake, which at first sight appeared to be an expanse of still water, frequently interrupted by clumps of dwarf trees or islets of rushes and shrubs; but on a nearer approach we found it to be in reality an extensive plain of mineral pitch, with frequent crevices and chasms filled with water. The singularity of the scene was altogether so great, that it was some time before I could recover from my surprise so as to investigate it minutely. The surface of the lake is of the color of ashes, and at this season was not polished or smooth so as to be slippery; the hardness or consistence was such as to bear any weight, and it was not adhesive, though it partially received the impression of the foot; it bore us

---

form an idea of the possibility of the elevation of the great solid masses that have produced the obelisks of Auvergne and of the projecting walls of basalt terminating the veins of that substance.

without any tremulous motion whatever, and several head of cattle were browsing on it in perfect security. In the dry season, however, the surface is much more yielding, and must be in a state approaching to fluidity, as is shown by pieces of recent wood and other substances being enveloped in it. Even large branches of trees which were a foot above the level, had in some way become enveloped in the bituminous matter. The interstices or chasms are very numerous, ramifying and joining in every direction; and in the wet season being filled with water, present the only obstacle to walking over the surface; these cavities are generally deep in proportion to their width, some being only a few inches in depth, others several feet, and many almost unfathomable; the water in them is good and uncontaminated by the pitch; the people of the neighborhood derive their supply from this source, and refresh themselves by bathing in it; fish are caught in it, and particularly a very good species of mullet. The arrangement of the chasms is very singular; the sides, which of course are formed of the pitch, are invariably shelving from the surface, so as nearly to meet at the bottom, but then they bulge out towards each other with a considerable degree of convexity. This may be supposed to arise from the tendency in the pitch slowly to coalesce, whenever softened by the intensity of the sun's rays. These crevices are known occasionally to close up entirely, and we saw many marks or seams from this cause. How these crevices originate it may not be so easy to explain. One of our party suggested that the whole mass of pitch might be supported by the water which made its way through accidental rents, but in the solid state it is of greater specific gravity than water, for several bits thrown into one of the pools immediately sunk.* The lake, (I call it so, because I think the common name appropriate enough) contains many islets covered with long grass and shrubs,

* Pieces of asphaltum are, I believe, frequently found floating on the Dead Sea in Palestine, but this arises probably from the extraordinary specific gravity of the waters of that lake, which Dr. Marcet found to be 1.211. Mr. Hatchell states the specific gravity of ordinary asphaltum to vary from 1.023 to 1.165; but in the two varieties of that of Trinidad, it was as great as 1.336 and 1.744.

which are the haunts of birds of the most exquisite plumage, as the pools are of snipe and plover. Alligators are also said to abound here, but it was not our lot to encounter any of these animals. It is not easy to state precisely the extent of this great collection of pitch; the line between it and the neighboring soil is not always well defined, and indeed it appears to form the substratum of the surrounding tract of land. We may say, however, that it is bounded on the north and west sides by the sea, on the south by the rocky eminence of porcelain jasper, before mentioned, and on the east by the usual argillaceous soil of the country; the main body may perhaps be estimated at three miles in circumference; the depth cannot be ascertained, and no subjacent rock or soil can be discovered. Where the bitumen is slightly covered by soil, there are plantations of cassava, plantains and pine-apples, the last of which grow with luxuriance, and attain to great perfection. There are three or four French and one English sugar estate in the immediate neighborhood; our opinions of the soil did not, however, coincide with that of Mr. Anderson, who in the account he gave some years ago, thought it very fertile. It is worthy of remark, that the main body of the pitch which may properly be called the lake, is situated higher than the adjoining land, and that you descend by a gentle slope to the sea, where the pitch is much contaminated by the sand of the beach. During the dry season, as I have before remarked, this pitch is much softened, so that different bodies have been known slowly to sink into it; if a quantity be cut out, the cavity left will be shortly filled up; and I have heard it related, that when the Spaniards undertook formerly to prepare the pitch for economical purposes, and had imprudently erected their cauldrons on the very lake, they completely sunk in the course of a night, so as to defeat their intentions. Numberless proofs are given of its being at times in this softened state: the negro houses of the vicinage, for instance, built by driving posts in the earth, frequently are twisted or sunk on one side. In many places it seems to have actually overflown like lava, and presents the wrinkled appearance which a sluggish substance would exhibit in motion.

This substance is generally thought to be the asphaltum of naturalists: in different spots however it presents different

appearances. In some parts it is black, with a splintery conchoidal fracture, of considerable specific gravity, with little or no lustre, resembling particular kinds of coal, and so hard as to require a severe blow of the hammer to detach or break it; in other parts, it is so much softer, as to allow one to cut out a piece in any form with a spade or hatchet, and in the interior is vesicular and oily; this is the character of by far the greater portion of the whole mass; in one place it bubbles up in a perfectly fluid state, so that you may take it up in a cup, and I am informed that in one of the neighboring plantations there is a spot where it is of a bright colour, shining, transparent, and brittle, like bottle-glass or resin. The odour in all these instances is strong and like that of a combination of pitch and sulphur. No sulphur however is any where to be perceived, but from the strong exhalation of that substance and the affinity which is known to exist between the fluid bitumen and it, much is, no doubt, contained in a state of combination; a bit of the pitch held in the candle melts like sealing wax and burns with a light flame which is extinguished whenever it is removed; and on cooling the bitumen hardens again. From this property it is sufficiently evident that this substance may be converted to many useful purposes; and accordingly it is universally used in the country wherever pitch is required.

* * * * * *

I have been informed by several persons that the sea in the neighbourhood of La Braye is occasionally covered with a fluid bitumen, and in the south-eastern part of the island there is certainly a similar collection of this bitumen, though of less extent, and many small detached spots of it are to be met with in the woods: it is even said that an evident line of communication may thus be traced between the two great receptacles. There is every probability, that in all these cases the pitch was originally fluid, and has since become inspissated by exposure to the air, as happens in the Dead Sea and other parts of the east.

ARTICLE III.

BAPTISM:—THE IMPORT OF Βαπτίζω.

By Rev. Edward Beecher, President of Illinois College, Jacksonville, Illinois.

To engage anew in the discussion of the subject of Baptism, may seem to need an apology. Mine is, that it is a point in which Christians are not as yet agreed, and therefore all truth is not seen. For I cannot think that God has of design hidden the truth, or that he has revealed it doubtfully on a point which has proved to be of such magnitude by its practical results. Hence I believe that when all truth is seen on this subject, which may be seen, all true Christians will so far agree that no obstacle to their perfect union in feeling and action will remain.

But the truth on this, as on all other subjects, is not to be elicited by the action of any one mind, but by the united contributions of many.

When in the dark ages, in the midnight of Papal gloom, all truth was lost or obscured, and the social fabric erected on principles radically corrupt, it pleased God to make no new revelation, nor to raise up and illumine any one gigantic mind, of power to grasp all truth and to restore it at once to its systematic proportion, or to erect in all its harmony a model of the social system in its perfect state.

Of the universal system different individuals grasped different parts, yet still mingled with much error, and thus God accomplished that which no single mind was capacious enough to do. He grasped, through many minds, the great outlines of the system of universal truth, so that none might be lost. Yet as in individual minds it was still limited and mingled with much error, divisions and sects arose, each holding important truth, which God was not willing to lose; and yet not so unmingled or in such proportions that all could unite as one.

But this mixture of error with truth is not destined always to last. The movement of the mind of the universal church is destined still to be upward; for she is taught of God.

And in completing the fabric which he is about to erect, &c shall contribute his portion of truth to the grand result, whilst the errors of each shall disappear and die away. Then shall all finite minds be harmonized in one by the all-pervading mind of God. As if to prepare the way for this result, the public mind has of late been directed with new interest to this subject. It has been brought up by certain great questions in evangelizing the world, and has excited much attention.

It has elicited works of much talent and extensive research through a wide field of philology. The spirit of the discussion has been much ameliorated, at least in many of the leading writers, though not always in the local and subordinate controversies. Yet union is far from being obtained, nay, in some particulars the prospect is more discouraging than ever. This must be a matter of grief to all who desire the fulfilment of the prayer of Christ. Nor is it in harmony with the convictions of the age on the duty of Christian unity, for however Christians practise, they are more and more convinced that there is something wrong and offensive to God in the present divided state of the Church.

We have reason, then, to suppose that exactly the right ground has not been taken on either side, and we ought to aim at the simple ground of truth for the sake of union and the common good.

To furnish some small share of the materials which God may use in producing this result, is my object in this effort.—And at present my remarks will relate entirely to the *mode* of Baptism.

§ 1. *Statement of the case, and of principles of investigation.*

The case is this: Christ has enjoined the performance of a duty in the command to baptize.

What is the duty enjoined?—or, in other words, what does the word *Baptize*, in which the command is given, mean? One of two things must be true;—

1. Either it is in its meaning generic, denoting merely the production of an effect, (as purity,) so that the command may be fulfilled in many ways;—or, it is so specific, denoting an external act, that it can be fulfilled in but one. To illustrate by an analogous case, Christ said, "Go teach all nations." Here the word go, is so generic as to include

all modes of going which any one may choose to adopt. If a man walks, or runs, or rides, or sails, he equally fulfils the command. On the other hand, some king or ruler, for particular reasons, might command an act by a word entirely specific, as for example, that certain mourners should *walk* in a funeral procession. Now it is plain that such a command could not be fulfilled by riding, or by running, for though these are modes of going, they are not models of walking, and the command is not to go in general, but specifically to walk. So when a general says, *March*, it will not answer for the soldiers to run; for, though this is a mode of going, it is not a mode of marching.

So likewise, when Christ said baptize, he either used a word which had a generic sense, denoting an effect, such as purify, cleanse, or a specific sense denoting an act, such as immerse, sprinkle, dip.

2. Whichever way we decide, as it regards the import of the word, we ought to be uniform in its use as applied to the rite of baptism. For though the same word may have diverse meanings when applied to different things and in various circumstances, yet it certainly cannot, when applied to the same thing and in the same circumstances.

Hence, if we adopt the generic meaning, purify or cleanse, we must adhere to it at all times, when speaking of the rite. On the other hand, if we adopt a specific meaning, as immerse, or sprinkle, we must adhere to it in the same way, and not pass from the generic to the specific, or from the specific to the generic, according to exigencies, on the ground that the word Βαπτίζω, may in the whole circuit of its use, mean sometimes one thing and sometimes another. Nor must we adopt both, for however numerous the possible meanings of a word may be in its various usages, it has in each particular case but one meaning, and in all similar cases its meaning is the same. Hence the word Βαπτίζω, as applied to a given rite has not two or many meanings, but one, and to that one, we should in all cases adhere.

3. If we adopt a generic meaning, denoting an effect, we are not limited by the command to any specific mode of fulfilling it, and are at liberty to vary the mode according to circumstances. But if we adopt a specific meaning, denoting an external act, we are limited by the very import of the command, to the range of that meaning.

Hence if the command is purify, or cleanse, we are not limited by the command to any one mode, but may choose that which seems to us most appropriate, whether it be sprinkling, pouring, or immersion.

But if the command is specific, as immerse, then we are limited by the range of that word, and cannot fulfil the command by sprinkling, or pouring, for these are not modes of immersion, any more than riding is a mode of walking, or writing a mode of painting.

It is true that sprinkling and pouring may be modes of purifying,—and so is riding a mode of going. But if the command is not purify, but immerse, then all debate as to the mode is at an end, for you can immerse, not by sprinkling, but only by immersion.

§ 2. *Causes of the disregard of these principles, and false positions to which this disregard has given rise.*

Though the principles stated are simple and obvious, yet the natural operations of the mind on questions of philology have been in this case embarrassed and perplexed by certain influences of a kind peculiar to this word.

At the time of the translation of the Bible, a controversy had arisen as it regards the import of the word, so that, although it was conceded to have an import in the original, yet it was impossible to assign to it in English any meaning without seeming to take sides in the controversy then pending.

Accordingly, in order to take neither side, they did not translate the word at all, but merely transferred it with a slight alteration of termination to our language. The consequence was that it ceased to exhibit its original significancy to the mind of the reader, or indeed any significancy except what was derived from its application to designate an external visible rite.—In short, it became merely the name of a rite, and had a usage strictly technical, and lost to the ear whatever significance it originally had.

The habit of using the word in a technical sense has tended to unfit the mind for the discussion of the question as to the mode of baptism in various ways, of which I shall mention three.

1. It has led to a departure from the principles already stated, that words, when applied to the same subject, and in the same circumstances, cannot have a double sense. This

rule, as has been remarked, does not forbid that the same word in different circumstances should have various senses, accordingly it may be conceded that the word, Βαπτίζω has various senses in the wide range of its usage, in scriptural and classical Greek, but out of this variety of usages, there is one strictly of a religious nature, and having direct reference to one of the great revealed facts of Christianity. Now in a case like this, the laws of philology require that some one of the meanings of the word should be fixed on and assigned to it in all cases. But the habit of using the word baptize in a strictly technical sense, as the name of a rite, has led to a disregard of this simple and obvious rule.

Many writers, fixing their minds merely upon the idea of a rite, and finding that the word Βαπτίζω, means sometimes to wash, sometimes to immerse, and sometimes, as they think, to pour or sprinkle, conclude that the rite of baptism may be performed in either way, entirely forgetting that, although the word should happen, in the wide range of its usage, scriptural and classical, secular and religious, to have all these meanings, it by no means follows that when used as a religious term, it has more than one. Hence, if as a religious term, and in certain circumstances, it means immerse, it does not also in similar circumstances mean to wet or to wash, to sprinkle or to pour, to color or to dye, but simply to immerse. And just as plainly, if in some cases of its religious use, it means to purify, it does not in others of the same kind mean to pour, to sprinkle, or to immerse.

2. The other mode in which the technical use of this word has unfitted the mind for a fair consideration of the question is, it has permitted the introduction of a discussion as to the mode of baptism, after concessions have been made, which ought for ever to exclude it. For example, the question arises what meaning did the word *βαπτίζω*, convey to those, who in the age of the New Testament writers read the command, go baptize all nations? Was it to immerse? So our brethren the Baptists maintain, and so many who do not immerse concede. Now after such a concession, with what propriety they can debate any longer as to the mode, I acknowledge that I cannot perceive. Nor do I think, that they would do it were it not for an illusion practised by the technical word *Baptize*, upon their minds.

After admitting as a point of philology, that the word

βαπτίζω in its religious use means immerse, the mind seems to revert to the old habit of using the Anglicised word *baptism*, without attaching to it any meaning, and we are at once told that it is of no use to dispute as to the mode of baptism. Suppose, now, instead of the word baptism, we substitute the meaning which it has been conceded to have, and the illusion is at once exposed. We concede that *βαπτίζω* means immerse, but of what use is it to dispute concerning the mode of immersion? of none surely, so you do but immerse. But can you immerse by sprinkling? Is sprinkling a mode of immersion? The fact is, that if the word denotes a given definite act, no other dissimilar act, is or can be a mode of it. Pouring is not a mode of sprinkling or of immersion, nor is sprinkling a mode of pouring or of immersion, nor is immersion a mode of sprinkling or pouring.

3. Others again still using the word merely as a technic, say that baptism is the application of water, in any way, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; but base their conclusions rather on reason and the nature of the case, or on the design of the rite, than on a thorough philological investigation of the word. Now the defect of this last mode of reasoning is that it does not interpret the command. It uses the word like a technic, having no meaning of its own, and gives rather a description of a rite than a definition of Βαπτίζω.

No one ever pretended to *define* Βαπτίζω as meaning "to apply water in any way"—of course Baptism cannot be defined to be "the application of water in any way." And whether this view of the rite is correct or not, must depend entirely on the meaning of the word.

§ 3. *Statement of the position to be proved.*

From what has been said it is plain that those who have written on the subject of the mode of Baptism may be arranged in four classes.

1. Those who maintain that the word in the whole extent of its usage has various meanings, and from this fact alone draw the inference that, therefore, the rite may be performed in various ways, making at the same time no attempt to prove which of its possible meanings it actually has in the case in question.

2. Those who fix on a specific meaning—e. g. immerse, and which of course excludes all dispute as to the word, and yet insist that no more is essential.

3. Those who look mainly at the obvious design of the rite, i. e. to indicate purity, and on this ground affirm that to Baptize is to apply water in any way which denotes purity, without attempting to make out a philological proof of the truth of their position from the import of the word Βαπτίζω.

4. Those who insist that the word in all its extent of usage has but one meaning—viz. to immerse—and that this excludes all debate as to the word.

None of these positions is in my judgment adapted to explain all the facts which occur in the use of the word, and to give satisfaction and rest to an inquiring mind. Any view which shall effectually do this will be found to have the following requisites:

(1.) That it shall be strictly philological.

(2.) That out of all the possible meanings of βαπτίζω, it shall fix on one as the real meaning in the case in question.

(3.) That it shall at all times steadily adhere to this.

(4.) That this shall limit the performance of the rite to no particular mode.

The position which I shall endeavor to prove in accordance with these views is this, that the word βαπτίζω, as a religious term, means neither dip nor sprinkle, immerse nor pour—nor any other external action in applying a fluid to the body, or the body to a fluid—nor any action which is limited to one mode of performance. But that as a religious term it means at all times, to purify, or cleanse—words of a meaning so general as not to be confined to any mode, or agent, or means, or object, whether material or spiritual, but to leave the widest scope for the question as to the mode—so that in this usage it is in every respect a perfect synonym of the word καθαρίζω.

Let it then be borne in mind, that the question is not this, Does the word in all its extent of usage denote *at any time* a definite external act? nor this, Is this its *original, primitive* signification? Even if all this were admitted, it would not touch the question—for, as we all know, nothing is more common than for words to be used in more meanings than one, and to decide in what sense a word is used in a given instance, we are not to follow etymology or fancy, but evidence, derived from the facts of the case.

With regard then to other uses of the word βαπτίζω, I freely admit that in classic usage it does, as a general fact, clearly denote some external act of a specific kind, yet it is by no means clear to my mind that it does not in different cases denote different acts. And though I do not regard it as an integral part of the argument which I propose to construct, yet for the sake of completeness, I think it best to state what seems to be the truth on this point.

1. I freely admit that in numerous cases it clearly denotes to immerse—in which case an agent submerges partially or totally some person or thing. Indeed, this is so notoriously true, that I need attempt no proof. Innumerable examples are at hand, and enough may be found, in all the most common discussions of the subject.

2. It is also applied to cases where a fluid is poured copiously over any thing so as to flood it, though not completely or permanently to submerge it. Of this usage I shall adduce but one example :—Origen, referring to the copious pouring of water by Elijah on the wood and on the sacrifice, represents him as baptizing them. For the passage, and remarks on it, see Wall's History of Infant Baptism.

3. It is also applied to cases where a fluid without an agent rolls over or floods, and covers any thing—as in the oft quoted passage in Diodorus Siculus, Vol. VII. p. 191, as translated by Prof. Stuart: "The river, borne along by a more violent current, overwhelmed many" (ἐβάπτιζε). So, Vol. I. p. 107, he speaks of land animals intercepted by the Nile, as βαπτιζομένα, overwhelmed, and perishing. The same mode of speaking is also applied to the sea shore, which is spoken of by Aristotle as baptized or overwhelmed by the tide.

4. It is also applied in cases where some person or thing sinks passively into the flood. Thus Josephus, in narrating his shipwreck on the Adriatic, uses this word to describe the sinking of the ship.

I am aware that by some writers rigorous efforts are made to reduce all these senses to the original idea to immerse or dip. But it seems to me that they are rather led by their zeal to support a theory, than by a careful induction from facts ; and that they wrest facts to suit their principles, rather than derive their principles from facts.

To me it seems plain that in all these cases there is a material difference, as to the external act, nor am I prepared to

admit that either, in preference to the other, is the original and primitive meaning of the word. If it were an object of much importance to decide what this is, inasmuch as they all agree in one common idea of a state or condition, though variously caused, I should incline to give to the word the meaning to cause to come into that state, and this idea is favored by the termination, ιζω. The state is, a state of being enveloped or surrounded by a fluid, or any thing else adapted to produce such a result. And a general meaning of βαπτίζω would thus be to cause to come into this state—whether it be done by pouring the fluid copiously over an object, or by the flowing of a fluid over an object, without the intervention of any agent, or by the passive sinking of an object into it. In all these cases the state of the object becomes the same, but the external act, by which it comes into this state, is not the same in either case.

To all this, however, I attach no great importance in the discussion of the present question; unless it be of use in exposing the fallacy of all efforts to reduce this word to such a perfect simplicity of meaning, even as it regards an external act, as is claimed for it by some.

On the other hand, even if I were to admit that its original and primitive idea was to immerse, and that when it denotes an external act, it never departs from this sense; still the question would arise, is there not another meaning derived from the effects of this act, and in which the mind contemplates the effect alone, entirely irrespective of the mode in which it is produced.

I contend that there is—and that as thorough purification or cleansing is often the result of submersion in water, so the word βαπτίζω has come to signify to purify or cleanse thoroughly, without any reference to the mode in which it is done.

§ 4.

There is not *a priori* the least improbability of such a change of meaning, from the laws of the mind, or of language.

It may at first sight seem an improbable position to some, that if a word originally signifies "to immerse," it can assume a meaning so remote from its primitive sense as "*to purify*," and entirely drop all reference to the mode.

Yet the slightest attention to the laws of the mind, and to

well-known facts, will show that not the least improbability of such a result exists.

No principle is more universally admitted by all sound philologists, than that to establish the original and primitive meaning of a word, is not at all decisive as it regards its subsequent usages. It often aids only as giving a clue by which we can trace the progress of the imagination, or the association of ideas in leading the mind from meaning to meaning, on some ground of relative similitude, or connexion of cause and effect.

So the verb *to spring*, denotes an act, and gives rise to a noun denoting an act. A perception of similitude transfers the word to the issuing of water from a fountain—to the motion of a watch-spring—and to the springing of plants in the spring of the year. Yet who does not feel that to be able to trace such a process of thought, is far from proving that, when a man in one case says, I made a *spring* over the ditch, in another, I broke the *spring* of my watch, in another, I drank from the *spring*, in another, I prefer *spring* to winter, he means in each case the same thing by the word *spring?* And who in using these words, always resorts to the original idea of the verb? Indeed, so far is it from being true that this is commonly done, that most persons are pleased when the track of the mind is uncovered, and the path is pointed out by which it passed from meaning to meaning, as if a new idea had been acquired—so *conversation*, *prevent*, *charity*, as now used, have obviously departed widely from the sense in which they were used in the days of the translators of the Bible.

But to multiply words on a point so plain, would be needless, had not so much stress been laid on the supposed original meaning of this word. It is therefore too plain to be denied, that words do often so far depart from their primitive meaning, as entirely to leave out the original idea—and that the secondary senses of a word are often by far the most numerous and important.

Moreover, to establish such secondary meanings, it is not necessary that we should be able to trace the course of the mind, though it is pleasant to be able to do it. A secondary meaning, however unlike it may seem to the primitive, may yet be established like any other fact in the usage of language, that is by appropriate testimony.

But whilst such transitions are common in all words, they are particularly common in words of the class of βαπτίζω denoting action by, or with reference to, a fluid.—This is owing to the fact that the effects produced by the action, depend not on the action alone, but on the action and the fluid combined—and of course may be varied as the fluid or its application varies.

Let us now take the general idea of enveloping or immersing in a fluid, and see how unlike the effects to which it may give rise.

If the envelopment is produced by a flood, a torrent or waves, the effect may be to overwhelm, to oppress, to destroy.

If, by taking up the object and immersing it into a coloring fluid, it is to impart a new color, or to dye.

If by taking up an object and immersing it into a cleansing fluid—or by going into a fluid—or by pouring the fluid copiously over the object, the effect is to purify or cleanse.

And on these natural or material senses, may be founded the same number of spiritual or moral senses, by transferring the ideas to the mind.

Now as a matter of fact such transfers have taken place in cognate and similar words.

I shall out of many select a few cases from Greek, Latin, English, and Hebrew words, fully to illustrate, and clearly to confirm these principles, and to show that they are peculiar to no language, but rest on universal laws of the mind.

In Greek all admit that the most common sense of βάπτω is to dip, to immerse. I am willing to admit that it is the primitive sense.

But it is beyond all dispute that the same word has passed to the meaning to dye, without any reference to mode. Great efforts were once made to deny this. But the most intelligent Baptists now entirely abandon this ground, and that with the best reason. And indeed, so far has the word passed from its original sense that it is applied to coloring the surface of an object by gold, i. e. to gilding. A few examples out of many in so plain a case must suffice. In the battle of the frogs and mice, a mouse is represented as dying or coloring the lake with his blood—ἐβάπτετο αἵματι λιμνή. On this there was once a battle royal to prove that it could be proper to speak of dipping a lake into the blood of a mouse; and all the powers of rhetoric were put in requisition to jus-

tify the usage. Hear now Mr. Carson, inferior in learning and research to none of the Baptists: "To suppose that there is here any extravagant allusion to the literal immersion or dipping of a lake, is a monstrous perversion of taste. The lake is said to be *dyed*, not to be *dipped*, or *poured*, or *sprinkled*. *There is in the word no reference to mode.* Had Baptists entrenched themselves here, they would have saved themselves much useless toil, and much false criticism, without straining to the impeachment of their candor or their taste. What a monstrous paradox in rhetoric is the figuring of the dipping of a lake in the blood of a mouse! Yet Dr. Gale supposes that the lake was dipped by hyperbole. The literal sense he says is, the lake was *dipped in blood*. Never was there such a figure. The lake is not said to be *dipped in blood*, but to be *dyed with* blood." P. 67, Am. edition, N. York, 1832. This is well said, and is the more to our purpose on account of its author. Indeed his whole discussion of this point is able, lucid, and decisive. Of the examples adduced by him I shall quote one or two more.

"Hippocrates employs it to denote dying, by dropping the dying liquid on the thing dyed: ἐπειδὰν ἐπιπταξῃ ἐπι τα ἱμάτια βάπτεται: 'When it *drops* upon the garments they are *dyed*.' This surely is not dying by dipping." Carson, p. 60.

"Again. In Arrian—Expedition of Alexander: τοὺς δὲ πωγωνας λέγει Νεαρχὸς ὅτι βάπτονται ὑπὸ: 'Nearchus relates that the Indians dye their beards.' It will not be contended that they *dyed* their beards by immersion." P. 61.

He quotes cases in which it is used to describe the coloring of the hair; the staining of a garment by blood; the staining of the hand by crushing a coloring substance in it; for which, and others of a like kind, I refer to him, and to Prof. Stuart.

In the compounds and derivations of this word the sense to dye is very extensive; to be fully satisfied of which, let any one examine the Thesaurus of H Stephens, or the abbreviation of it by Scapula on this word.

It is compounded with colors of all kinds, as πορφυροβαφης ὑακινθινοβαφὴς, of a purple, or hyacinthine dye. It denotes a dyer, a dying vat, a dye-house, etc., βαφεὺς βαφεῖον, etc., and it even passes, as before stated, to cases in which a new color is produced by the external application of a solid, as χρυσοβαφης, colored with gold, or gilded.

But it is needless to quote at large all the examples which might be adduced to illustrate and confirm these points; and as all that I claim is conceded even by our Baptist brethren, to proceed farther would seem like an attempt at useless display. I shall therefore proceed to consider the usages of a kindred word in the Latin language.

Tingo, beyond all doubt, means to immerse. In this sense Facciolatus and Forcellinus in their Totius Latinitatis Lexicon give *βάπτω* as its synonyme. And as *βάπτω* is used to describe the immersing of an axe to temper it, so is *tingo* to describe similar operations. So Virgil speaking of the operations of the Cyclopian workmen of Vulcan thus describes them as immersing the hissing metals in water to temper them. Stridentia tingunt æra lacu. Æ. 8. 450.

So speaking of a sword.

Tinxerat unda stygia ensem. Æ. 12. 91. Celsus speaks of sponges dipped in vinegar. Spongia in aceto tincta.

The setting of the heavenly bodies is spoken of as an immersion in the sea and to describe this *tingo* is used,

Tingere se oceano properant soles hyberni. Virg. Geor. 2. 481.

Tingat equos gurgite Phœbus. Æ. 11. 914.

But to prove that it means immerse is needless; no one can deny it, nor is it the point at which I chiefly aim. This is, that like *βάπτω*, it loses all reference to the act of immersion and comes to signify simply to dye or color in any way.

Of this there is a presumptive proof that is obvious even to those who do not understand the learned languages. It has given rise to the words tinge and tint in our language—and who that speaks of the rosy tints of morn—or of the sun tinging the clouds with golden light would have the least thought of immersion. And is it probable that such senses would have passed from the Latin to our language, had *tingo* not passed from its original sense to that of dying or coloring in any mode.

But there is direct proof in the Latin classics of the same kind as exists with respect to *βάπτω*.

Horace uses the word to denote the dying of wool, as tingere lanas murice; Ovid, to denote the coloring of the hair, and of ivory; Horace, to denote the coloring of the axe used in sacrificing the victims, as victima pontificum secures cervice tinget; Virgil, Geor. 3. v. 492, to denote the

malignant effects of a plague on cattle, mentions that they had scarce blood enough left to color the knives used to slay them.

Vix suppositi tinguntur sanguine cultri.

So in Georg. 2 : v. 8. We have the words Tinge crura musto, referring to the coloring or staining of the legs by the treading of the wine press. In Pliny we have Tingentium officinæ, shops of dyers, and in Cicero, Tincta in the phrase to denote colored things. It is followed by an accusative of the color, as in Pliny tingere cœruleum, to dye blue. We have also in Lucretius Loca lumine tinguntur nubes—to tinge or color, that is to illuminate with light. See Forcellinus and Facciolatus, or Leverett's Lexicon, on the word.

Indeed on this word no less than on βάπτω we have the unequivocal concession of Mr. Carson, that it means to dye. "In Latin also, the same word, tingo, signifies both to dip and to dye." Carson, p. 77.

Facciolatus, and Forcellinus and Leverett also give it the sense to moisten, to wet, and make it in this sense synonymous with τεγγω—from which indeed it is derived, and to my mind the examples adduced are abundantly sufficient to establish this sense. But on this it is needless to insist, as Mr. Carson professes not to be satisfied that this sense can be established, and for the present I wish to rely on facts concerning which there is no dispute.

In English for the sake of contrast, I shall select the word to wash.

The original and common idea of this word is undeniably to cleanse by a purifying fluid, as water—and that without respect to mode. Of these ideas in its progress it drops all, and assumes a meaning that involves neither to purify nor to use a fluid at all.

As washing is often performed by a superficial application of a fluid, it often assumes this sense and loses entirely the idea of cleansing, as when we speak of washing a wound with brandy ; or with some cooling application to alleviate inflammation. In this case we aim not at cleansing but at medicinal effect. So we speak of the sea as washing the shores or rocks, denoting not cleansing, but the copious superficial application of a fluid.

Again, as a superficial application of a fluid or a coloring mixture is often made for the sake of changing the color, we

have to white-wash, to red-wash, to yellow-wash; and the substances or fluid mixtures with which this is done, are called washes.

Next it drops the idea of a fluid at all, and assumes the sense of a superficial application of a solid—as to wash with silver or gold.

And here a remarkable coincidence in result, in words of meaning originally unlike, deserves notice as a striking illustration of the progress of the mind in effecting such changes.

In Greek, *βαπτω*, denotes originally to immerse—action alone, without reference to effect. In English, wash denotes to cleanse or purify alone, without reference to mode. Yet by the operation of the laws of association, both are used to denote coloring, and both to denote covering superficially with silver or gold.

Finally, when we speak of the wash of a cow-yard, and call those places where deposites of earth or filth, or vegetable matter are made, washes, who will contend that the idea of purity is retained?

Again, *lustro* denotes *to purify*, by certain religious rites, and especially by *carrying around* the victim previously to its being killed.

From this it passes to the idea of passing around or through—dropping the idea of purifying—as Pythagoras Egyptum lustravit. *Cicero*—Pythagoras traversed Egypt. Navibus lustrandum æquor. *Virg.*—the ocean to be traversed with ships.

Hence it passes to the idea of observing, surveying, accurately examining, either with the eyes, or the mind. Totum lustrabat lumine corpus, *Virg.* He scrutinized, or examined his whole body with his eyes. Cum omnia ratione animoque lustraris, when you shall have surveyed and accurately examined all things by your reason and in your mind.

And what wider departure from the original sense to purify is possible? In Leveret *καθαρσις* is given as a synonyme of lustratio, and yet the same word is used to denote travelling from city to city. Lustratio municipiorum—also the course or circuit of the sun—lustratio solis.

So too in Ezek. 23: 15 טָבַל to immerse is used to denote dying—where מְטֻבָּלִים denotes dyed attire, as Mr. Carson also allows.

Similar transitions of meaning could be pointed out in *lavo* כָּבַס and שָׁטַף and other words, were it at all necessary, and did time allow.

Now with such facts before us, to increase the number of which indefinitely, were perfectly easy, who can say that there is the slightest improbability in the idea that the word *βαπτίζω* should pass from the sense to immerse, to the sense to purify, without reference to the mode? Can *βαπτω*, tingo and wash, pass through similar transitions and cannot *βαπτίζω*?

But what secondary sense shall be adopted cannot be told *a priori*, but must be decided by the habits, manners, customs and general ideas of a people, and sometimes by peculiar usages for which no reason can be given. For example, no reason exists in the nature of things why *βαπτω* rather than *βαπτίζω* should pass from the sense immerse to the sense to dye—yet there is evidence that it did. On the other hand it could not be certainly foretold that *βαπτίζω* rather than *βαπτω* would pass to the sense to cleanse, and yet that it did so pass may still be true, and if true can be proved like any other fact.

And the existence of manners and customs tending to such a result, renders such a result probable.

§ 5.

Circumstances did exist tending to produce such a transfer of meaning in *βαπτίζω*, and therefore there is a strong probability that it was made.

As it regards *βαπτω* and *tingo* we have no proof that any peculiar causes existed tending to such a change of meaning as they are confessed to have actually undergone.

But as it regards *βαπτίζω*, such a tendency can be proved to have existed in the manners and custom of the Jews, for though no immersions of the person were enjoined in the Mosaic ritual, but simply washings of the body, or flesh, in any way, yet there can be no doubt that immersions and bathings were in daily use—and these as well as all their other washings were solely for the sake of purity, and held up this idea daily before the mind.

Hence, when after the conquests of Alexander, the Greek language began to be spoken by the Jews, it encountered a

tendency of the same kind as that which had already changed the meaning of βάπτω to color or dye; but far more definite, powerful, and all-pervading; for the practice of immersing to color was limited to a few, but the practice of bathing or immersing to purify, was common to a whole nation. Indeed the idea of purification from uncleanliness pervaded their whole ritual, in numberless cases, and must have been perfectly familiar to the mind of every one.

The inference from these facts is so obvious that it hardly needs to be stated. As the laws of the mind made from βάπτω, to dye, to color, to paint, and from *tingo*, the same; so there is a very strong presumption that so general a use of immersion, to produce purity would give to βαπτίζω the corresponding sense, to purify. This does not, I am aware, prove that it did. But it opens the way for such proof and shows that there is not the least ground for the rigorous efforts that are made to set it aside.

Even a moderate degree of proof is sufficient in a case like this, when the most familiar laws of the mind and all the power of presumptive evidence from analogical cases tend this way.

§ 6.

There is no probability *a priori* against this position from the general nature of the subject to which the word is applied, in the rite of Baptism. But the probability is decidedly and strongly in its favor.

No law of philology is more firmly established than this, that in the progress of society, new ideas produce new words and new senses of old words, and hence in judging concerning such new senses we are to look at the nature of the new subjects of thought that arise.

Now that in this case the Greek language was applied to a new subject of thought is most plain, and that subject is the peculiar operations of the Holy Spirit, for that the ordinance of Baptism refers to these is admitted by all.

Now if any external act had any peculiar fitness to present these to the mind, a presumption would be in favor of that act; and if the meaning claimed was unfit to present them to the mind there would be a presumption against it.

Now so far is this from being the fact that directly the reverse is true. What is the peculiar effect of the opera-

tion of the Holy Ghost on the mind? Is it not moral cleansing or purification?

Now no word denoting merely a mode of applying a fluid to a thing, or of putting any thing into a fluid, conveys of itself any such idea. To pour, sprinkle, immerse, or dip, convey in themselves no idea at all of cleansing. The effect of the action depends mainly on the fluid, not on the action, and may be either to purify or to pollute. If clear water is used, the effect is to purify. If filthy water is used the effect is to pollute. So Job says, "If I wash myself with snow-water and make my hands never so clean, yet shalt thou plunge me" [Greek βάπτω. Heb. טבל] in the ditch, and my own clothes shall abhor me. Here the effect of plunging is pollution, because it is not into clean water but into filthy. Hence, *no external act has in itself any fitness to present to the mind the operations of the Holy Spirit.*

On the other hand to wash, to purify, to cleanse—all direct the mind to the very thing done by the Holy Spirit—hence the presumption is entirely against the supposition that the word denotes an external act, and in favor of the meaning claimed.

§ 7.

There is decided philological proof in favor of this view. This I shall soon proceed to adduce. But the course which the argument has too often taken, renders it necessary to make a few remarks on the principles of the reasoning involved.

It is commonly the case, that after proving that there are clear instances in which βαπτίζω means to immerse, it is assumed that it is violently improbable that it ever means any thing else, and that, if it can but be shown that in a given passage it can possibly mean immerse, no more is needed, so that the main force of argument is not to prove that it does so mean from the exigency of the place, but that it may possibly so mean, and therefore in consequence of its meaning so in other places, it does so here.

Prof. Ripley reasons on these principles in his reply to Prof. Stuart, but Mr. Carson has more boldly and fully developed them than any writer on that side of the question with whom I am acquainted. He goes so far as to say p. 108, 109, that when one meaning of a word is proved by

sufficient evidence, no objections to retaining this meaning in other places can be admitted as decisive, except they involve an impossibility. This he says is self-evident, and lays it down as a canon; and affirms, p. 106, that the man who does not perceive the justness of his positions is not worth reasoning with. Now that there is not the least ground for assuming the improbability of the meaning to purify, nay that the probability is decidedly in its favor, I have clearly shown. Of course to show that in a given case it can possibly mean immerse is nothing to the point. The question is what is its fair, natural and obvious sense in the case in question, not what it can possibly by any stretch of ingenuity be made to mean.

Of old it was customary in the same way to try to prove that *βάπτω* does not mean to dye, because some other sense is possible or conceivable—and as we have seen, Gale even goes so far as to maintain, that a lake is spoken of as figuratively dipped in the blood of a mouse—lest he should be obliged to admit the obvious sense that the lake was dyed, colored or tinged, with the blood of a mouse.

But this mode of reasoning, as it regards *βάπτω*, is at last candidly and fairly given up—and may we not hope that the same candor will at length, lead to the same results in the case of the cognate word *βαπτίζω*.

It may be farther observed that the reasoning of philology is not demonstrative, but moral and cumulative; and that an ultimate result depends upon the combined impression of all the facts of a given case as a whole—on the principle that the view, which best harmonizes all the facts, and falls in with the known laws of the human mind, is true.

And where many and separate and independent facts all tend with different degrees of probability to a common result, there is an evidence over and above the evidence furnished by each case by itself, in the coincidence of so many separate and independent probabilities in a common result. And to be able to prove that each may be explained otherwise, and is not in itself a demonstration, cannot break the force of the fact, that so many separate and independent probabilities all tend one way. The probability produced by such coincidences is greater than the sum of the separate probabilities: it has the force of the fact that they coincide—and that the assumption of the truth of the mean-

ing in which they all coincide, is the only mode of explaining the coincidence.

That there are various independent proofs, that βαπτίζω as a religious term means to purify, and that these all coincide, and that this view harmonizes and explains all the facts of the case, I shall now attempt to show.

§ 8.

In John 3 : 25, καθαρισμὸς is used as synonymous with βαπτισμὸς, and thus the *usus loquendi*, as it regards the religious rite is clearly decided.

The facts of the case are these, vs. 22, 23. John and Jesus were baptizing, one in Judea, the other in Ænon, near to Salem, and in such circumstances that to an unintelligent observer there would seem to be a rivalry between the claims of the two. The disciples of John might naturally feel that Jesus was intruding into the province of their master. They might even believe John to be the Messiah, and thus give rise to the sect which held that belief. On this point a dispute arose between the disciples of John and the Jews, (or a Jew as many copies read,) v. 25.

They come to John and state the case, v. 26. "Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest witness, *behold the same baptizeth, and all men come to him.*" Plainly implying that in so doing he was improperly interfering with the claims of John.

John in reply, v. 27—31, disclaims all honor except that bestowed on him by God, of being the forerunner of the Messiah, and rejoices to decrease in order that he may increase—thus justifying the course which was so offensive to his disciples, and settling the dispute in favor of the claims of Christ.

The argument from these facts is this: The dispute in question was plainly a specific dispute concerning baptism, as practised by Jesus and John, and not a general dispute on the subject of purification at large; so that ζήτησις περὶ βαπτισμοῦ is the true sense; and if it had been so written, the passage would have been regarded by all as perfectly plain.

But instead of βαπτισμοῦ, John has used καθαρισμοῦ, because the sense is entirely the same. In other words, "a question concerning baptism," and "a question concerning purifica-

tion," were at that time modes of expression perfectly equivalent; that is, βαπτισμὸς is a synonyme of καθαρισμὸς.

"The only mode of escaping this result is to say, that as immersion in water involves purification, and is a kind of purification, so it may have given rise to a question on the subject of purification at large; but to this I reply, that the whole scope of the passage forbids such an idea. The question was not general but specific, being caused by the concurrence of two claims to baptize; and so was the reply of John.

Moreover, to assume a general dispute on purification renders the whole scope of the passage obscure; as is evident from the fact that those who have not seen that in this case καθαρισμὸς is a synonyme of βαπτισμὸς, are much perplexed to see what a dispute on purification in general has to do with the facts of the case.

The origin of the dispute from the concurrence of two claims to baptize, is obviously indicated by the particle οὖν in v. 25, showing undeniably that the events just narrated gave rise to the question. This connexion does not appear in our translation, and hence the course of thought is somewhat obscured.

It is plain, then, that independently of all theories or interests, καθαρισμὸς is used as synonymous with βαπτισμὸς. Assigning this meaning makes the passage natural, lucid, and simple; to assume a general debate on purification at large, renders it forced and obscure, and the reply of John totally irrelevant.

And what reason is there for denying this conclusion? None but the fear of the result. No law of language requires it—no existing fact—no previous probability. These, as we have shown, are all decidedly the other way. It is then of no avail to talk of possible senses. The question is not what is possible, but what is a rational inference from a fair view of the facts of the case; and this I do not hesitate to say is, that βαπτισμὸς and καθαρισμὸς are synonymous.

I have spoken the more at large on this case, because it is so rarely referred to in arguments on this question, and because the light which it throws on the *usus loquendi* is peculiarly clear.

No word is more entirely independent of all reference to modes and forms than καθαρίζω, and nothing can more clearly show that βαπτίζω had dropped all reference to form, and

assumed the sense to purify or cleanse, than making it a synonyme of καθαρίζω. And the evidence is the more striking, as it is incidental and undesigned. It is as if we could stand on the plains of Judea and hear them interchange βαπτισμὸς and καθαρισμὸς as synonymous words.

But if this is the force of the word in one instance as a religious rite, then it is its force in all similar cases.

§ 9

This view alone fully explains the existing expectation that the Messiah would baptize.

That the Messiah should immerse is no where foretold; but that he should *purify*, is often and fully predicted.

But especially is this foretold in that last and prominent prophecy of Malachi, (iii. 1—3,) which was designed to fill the eye of the mind of the nation, until he came.

He is here presented to the mind in all his majesty and power, but amid all other ideas that of purifying is most prominent. He was above all things to purify and purge, and that with power so great, that few could endure the fiery day. Who may abide the day of his coming and who shall stand when he appeareth?

Suppose now the word βαπτίζω to mean as I affirm—the whole nation are expecting the predicted purifier; all at once the news goes forth that a great purifier has appeared and that all men flock to him and are purified in the Jordan. How natural the inference! the great purifier so long foretold, has at last appeared, and how natural the embassy of the Priests and Levites to enquire who art thou? and when he denied that he was the Messiah, or either of his expected attendants, how natural the inquiry, why purifiest thou then? It is his work—of him it is foretold, why dost thou intrude into his place and do his work?

In view of these facts I do not hesitate to believe most fully, that the idea which came up before the mind of the Jews when the words Ιωάννης ὁ Βαπτιστὴς were used, was not, John the immerser, or John the dipper, but John the purifier a name peculiarly appropriate to him as a reformer—as puritan was to our ancestors, and for the same reason.

This view has to my own mind the self-evidencing power of truth, for there is not the slightest presumption against it; all probable evidence is in its favor; and it explains and har-

monizes the facts of the case as no other view does. Indeed I can never read the account of John's baptism, and his various replies without feeling that this passage from Malachi gives color to them all. This idea I shall consider more at large in the following section.

§ 10.

The contrast made by John between his own baptism and that of Christ, illustrates and confirms the same view.

This contrast exists in three particulars—the subject, the agent, and the means.

In the case of John, the subject was the body—in the case of Christ, the mind.

In the case of John, the agent was material, i. e. a man—in the case of Christ the agent was the Holy Spirit. In the case of John, the means were water—in the case of Christ the truth and the emotions of God.

Now the idea to purify is perfectly adapted to illustrate and carry out such a contrast, but to immerse is not.

This sense is never transferred to the mind, in any language, so far as I know, to indicate any thing like the effects of the agency of the Holy Spirit.

Where oppressive, crushing, painful or injurious influences are denoted, it is so transferred—as μύριαις φρόντισιν βεβαπτισμένος τὸν νοῦν. *Chrysostom.* βαρύταταις ἁμαρτίαις βεβαπτισμένοι *Idem.*—πολλοῖς κύμασι πραγμάτων βεβαπτισμένοι *Idem*—and in this sense the overwhelming and crushing of Christ by cares and agony is spoken of as a baptism in the gospels. But this does not denote the peculiar and appropriate effects of the agency of the Holy Spirit.

But the sense to purify, can be with ease applied to body or mind, to human agents or to the Holy Spirit, to water or to the truth and divine influence.

How simple and natural the statement! "I indeed purify you with water—but he shall purify you with the Holy Spirit. I perform an external and symbolical rite, by which the body is cleansed with water, but he shall perform a higher cleansing, or that in which the mind itself is purified by the Spirit of God."

And how harsh, how forced, how unnatural to say, I immerse you in the Holy Spirit—and in fine, such a use of

language to denote such a thing is entirely foreign to all the laws of the human mind.

Indeed so much is the force of this felt, that in this part of the antithesis many resort to a new modification of the idea, and maintain that it means to imbue largely, to overwhelm with divine influences.

But this destroys the whole symmetry of the antithesis. John does not mean to say I immerse you largely with water, but either, I immerse you in water, or I cleanse you with it, and whichever sense we adopt in one part of the antithesis, we ought to retain in the other.

But when the agent is spiritual, the object spiritual, and the means spiritual, and the end purity, immersion is out of the question. Nothing but the most violent improbability of the sense to purify, can authorize us to reject it in such a case. But no such improbability exists; the probability is entirely in its favor. Purify, then, in any view of the subject must here be the sense.

This view is still further confirmed by comparing the language of John with the passage from Malachi already quoted. It seems to be at all times his great desire to lead them to apply those words to Christ, and not to himself. As if he had said, "Do not think that I am the great purifier spoken of in those words. After me cometh one mightier than I, the latchet of whose shoes I am unworthy to loose. He shall purify you with the Holy Ghost and with fire—whose fan is in his hand, and he shall thoroughly purge (διακαθαριεῖ) his floor," etc. But all the force, correspondence and natural illumination of these passages, depends on giving to the word βαπτίζω the sense which I claim.

§ 11.

In 1 Cor. xii. 13, the Holy Spirit is directly said to baptize, and in this case all external acts are of course excluded, and purify is the only appropriate sense.

"For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit."

If any shall say that joining the church by the external rite is here meant, I reply, that is never performed by the Spirit, but by man. But this baptism is as much a real work of the Holy Spirit, as the causing to drink into one Spirit, which is not external, but internal and real.

But to immerse in water is not the work of the Holy Spirit, nor is it his work to immerse the mind, but to purify the mind is. Moreover, not an external union to the visible Church, but a real union to the true and spiritual body of Christ is here meant, and this is produced by the purification of the mind, not by the immersion of the body. Hence to describe the operations of the Holy Spirit in uniting us to the body of Christ, *purify* is adopted—*immerse* is not.

§ 12.

βαπτίζω and καθαρίζω are so similarly used in connexion with the forgiveness of sins, as decidedly to favor the idea that they are in a religious use synonymous.

The purification effected by the Holy Spirit is of two kinds, (1.) a purification from spiritual defilement; (2.) a deliverance from the guilt of sin, i. e. liability to be punished, and from a sense of guilt, through the atonement.

It is through the atonement that pardon is given; and through the Holy Spirit conviction of sin is produced; and by him also a sense of guilt is taken away in view of the atonement; and in this sense he is said to cleanse from sin by the blood of Christ.

This kind of purification may be called legal, as it relates to guilt, forgiveness and an atonement. The other kind of purification may be called moral, inasmuch as it removes the unholy and impure feelings and habits of the mind and produces in their place those that are holy and pure.

Both kinds of purification are expressed by the same word καθαρίζω. Its use to denote legal purification or expiation is very extensive. It denotes, (1.) to make atonement. As in Ex. 29 : 37, and 30 : 10. "Thou shalt make atonement for the altar," "Aaron shall make atonement;" Sept. καθαρίζω, Heb. כִּפֶּר.

(2.) To forgive, Ex. 20 : 7. "The Lord will not *hold him guiltless* (οὐ καθαρισεῖ) that taketh his name in vain." Ex. 34 : 7. "That will by no means *clear* the guilty." Deut. 5: 11. *Idem.* In these and similar cases the Greek καθαρίζω corresponds to the Hebrew נָקָה to forgive, to absolve from punishment, and is used in a sense strictly legal, and does not refer to moral purity at all. So in 1 John i: 7. "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son *cleanseth* us from all sin;" and v. 9, He is faith-

ful and just to forgive us our sins, and to *cleanse* us from all unrighteousness. In these cases the idea of atonement and forgiveness by it, are involved in καθαρίζω, and in Heb. the blood of Christ is said *to purge* the conscience from dead works, implying a deliverance from a sense of guilt and a sense of pardoned sin. Καθαρίζω is here used; hence an atonement is called καθαρισμὸς in Heb. 1 : 3. When he had by himself purged our sins, (καθαρισμὸν ποιησάμενος,) he sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high. In this case the atonement, καθαισμὸς, was made first, and then applied to cleanse by the Holy Spirit.

Nor is this usage confined to Scriptural Greek; we find that when Crœsus exempted Adrastus from liability to punishment for killing his brother, it is said μὲν ἐκαθῆρε—he purified him—and when Adrastus requested such exemption, καθαρσιου ἐδέετο he requested expiation—or exemption from liability to punishment. Among the Jews this kind of purification was indicated by its appropriate external forms of which the sprinkling of blood was the most common—if not the only one. Besides this, as all know, καθαρίζω is used abundantly to denote moral purification or its emblem ceremonial purification—of which no examples are needed.

Hence to a Jew the most natural word to connect with the idea of the forgiveness of sins was καθαρισμὸς, or some synonymous word.

Between immersion, and the forgiveness of sins no such associations had ever been established. For all there missions of sin under the old ritual were by blood and hence Paul, Heb. 9 : 19—23, after speaking of the sprinkling of blood upon the people and the book of the tabernacle and the vessels says, καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν αἵματι πάντα καθαρίζεται κατὰ τὸν νόμον, καὶ χωρὶς αἱματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις.

Here the connexion of καθαρισμὸς and ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν—"purification," and "forgiveness of sins" are presented at once to the eye.

And there was no rite that involved immersion, which had any connexion with the forgiveness of sins.

Now if any word is found to sustain the same relations as καθαρισμὸς to the same idea, forgiveness of sins, we have reason to think that it is used in the same sense. But βαπτίζω and its derivatives do sustain the same relation. Mark 1 : 4. "John preached the Baptism of repentance for the forgive-

ness of sins,"—so in Luke 3 : 3. Also, Acts 3 : 38. "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost."

Here the idea is legal—the forgiveness of sins. The common expression for this is καθαρισμὸς—and baptism has a direct relation to it—and immersion is never used in any such relation. How natural then the conclusion that βαπτίσμὸς has the same sense as the word in whose familiar place it stands.

But though Baptism in these places relates chiefly to legal purification, in others it relates as clearly to moral purification, and in this respect also corresponds with καθαρίζω which as we have seen includes both kinds of purification, legal and moral.

To sum up all in a few words βαπτίζω as well as καθαρίζω relate to both kinds of purification legal and moral, of the conscience and of the heart; and the language most commonly applied to the first is καθαίρω or καθαρίζω—and this is always in the ritual symbolized by sprinkling and by blood. Hence as βαπτίζω has the same extent of application with καθαρίζω and as it stands in the same relations with it to the forgiveness of sins, it is highly probable that it has the same sense. By giving it a meaning so extensive as purify, it is adapted to fulfil all its relations. By confining it to a meaning so limited as to immerse, it is unfitted for at least one half of the relations in which it stands.

§ 13.

The account of Baptism given by Josephus, a cotemporary Jew, is perfectly in coincidence with this view.

[*To be continued.*]*

* Our limits oblige us to defer the remainder of this article. It will appear in the next No. of the Repository. The author examines several other passages of the New Testament in which βαπτίζω has the sense of καθαρίζω, and maintains by numerous quotations from the Fathers, that it was so understood by primitive Christians. The reader will find much that is curious and instructive in this discussion. EDITOR.

ARTICLE IV.

Ancient and Modern Eloquence.

By N. Cleaveland, Esq. Newbury, Mass.

In tracing the history of Eloquence, we are struck with the remarkable fact, that its earliest annals are also those of its most signal triumphs. In that age of wonders, when Athens burst upon the world in all the splendor of her literature, her arts, and arms, Eloquence was born. Like that most beautiful of the mythological fancies, the Goddess of Wisdom, it seems to have sprung at once to perfection, full-armed and glorious. We know, indeed, that Greece abounded in orators, before the age of Demosthenes. But the earlier and ruder efforts of the art, like the impassioned *talks* of our own Aborigines, perished with the occasions that produced them. The eloquence of Pericles, indeed, was of a higher stamp. He seems to have been the first great orator of Greece and the world. But though we are told, and can believe, that "he thundered, and lightened, and shook all Greece," no authentic specimen of his powers remains. Of the Athenian orators immediately preceding, and cotemporary with Demosthenes, we shall make no mention here, dimmed as they were, and ever must be, by his incomparable splendor.

The superiority of Demosthenes, and his claim to rank as the greatest of orators, is universally admitted. His reputation, like that of Homer, than which it is only *less* ancient, may be considered as resting on an immovable basis. It is established by the admiration of his acute and fastidious countrymen—by the unbounded sway which he exerted over them—and by the dread with which he inspired their foes. Cicero, the all-accomplished orator, philosopher and statesman—Quintilian, the greatest of rhetoricians—and Longinus the ablest of critics—alike awarded to him the palm of unrivalled eloquence. Nor has the decision of antiquity been reversed by the moderns. Little as his sententious energy has been imitated, its vast superiority is conceded by all.

It may be interesting to examine, somewhat particularly, the character of that eloquence which has thus secured the suffrage of ages, and of nations ;—and the rather as the praises which have been lavished upon it, must have excited the curiosity, if not the skepticism of those, who have never read either original or translation,—or whose reading has been limited to a few short extracts in our school-books. Even among the educated men of our country, Demosthenes, for obvious reasons, is much less known than Cicero. Selected orations of the latter form a part of the preparatory course for college, while the former is scarcely studied, even in college. To read the Grecian orator in his own tongue, with a just appreciation and relish of his merits, requires a familiarity with the language, which comparatively few attain. The Greek of Demosthenes is by no means easy. The very excellencies of his style, its conciseness and idiomatic structure, render the acquisition a serious labor, even for those who have become familiar with other Greek authors. He has indeed been well translated. But few take an interest in translations, which was not first inspired by the originals. It must be remembered also, that the best translation is an *imitation*, rather than *fac-simile*—that the Greek and English idioms are widely dissimilar—and that there are peculiarities in the style of Demosthenes, which render the transfer *especially* difficult. In view of these considerations, it may seem less strange, though not perhaps any less to be regretted, that the acknowledged Prince of orators should be so little known, and so imperfectly appreciated.

The grand characteristic of this great man is, undoubtedly, *strength*. "His peculiar properties," says Longinus, "specially vouchsafed to him by immediate dispensation of the Divinity, were unrivalled and *unapproachable* vigor and power." It is perhaps more easy to perceive the fact, than to tell *wherein* the great strength of this intellectual Samson lay.

We may say, in the first place, that he was eminently *argumentative*. No orator can be named, who in this respect is more original, more ingenious, or more logical. In statement he is succinct and clear. His arrangement is perfect without the *show* of arrangement ; and he is unerring in the sagacity with which he discovers his own strong points, and the weak ones of his adversary.

But his argumentation is never dry—it is never cold. His reasoning seems to proceed as much from the *heart* as from the *head*. He so intermingles his declamation with his argument, that it never appears to *be* declamation. Through the entire texture of his discourse, reason and passion, passion and reason, like warp and woof, are beautifully interwoven. Or perhaps it would be more accurate to say of this peculiar feature, that his argument is *impassioned*, and his declamation, *logical*. The profound, brilliant, impetuous flow of his eloquence is like that of some great river, when having escaped its rocky barriers, it has gained the gentler inclination of the alluvial plains;—no longer chafed and frothy as among the hills, nor discolored yet by admixture with the sea—deep, clear, rapid, sparkling—it rolls along, a noble image of beauty, grandeur, and irresistible power.

His conciseness has already been named. This trait was carried by our orator to such an extreme, that some have even deemed it a fault. But this we would be slow to assert. It is unquestionably one great source of his power. Every thing is finished with consummate care. Every word is significant and apt; and that very place is assigned to each, which makes it most effective. Hence, indeed, arises no small part of the difficulty of transfusing his spirit and power into another language.

With that exquisite tact, which never forsakes him, he stops always at the precise point of greatest effect. Having made a bold or happy stroke, he passes on to his argument or inference. By no needless explanation—by no superfluous embellishment, does he endanger the effect, or incur the hazard of "tearing his subject to tatters." How unlike, in this respect, to most orators of modern times!

But nothing seems to have attracted the wonder and admiration of his readers so much, as that oblivion of self which is conspicuous on every page. It is to the Olynthiacs and Philippics that we now refer. In these immortal productions *Demosthenes* seems to be nothing;—his subject—his cause—his country—*every thing*. Widely different was the case with Cicero, whose elaborate pictures rarely failed to exhibit the orator himself, the most prominent figure in the foreground. While we follow the Grecian orator, we cease to wonder at his success. Such earnestness and sincerity; such all-absorbing, self-renouncing patriotism, exhibited with

such force of argument, and such powers of appeal, could not but be resistless, for we cannot resist them ourselves. Once fairly in the stream, the torrent bears us on. We think not of stopping—we cannot stop if we would. Unreluctant captives, we surrender at discretion, and realize that it is exciting and delightful, thus to feel the influence of one master mind.

> While still "our little barks attendant sail,
> Pursue the triumph, and partake the gale."

As yet we have contemplated the orator only as he *is*,—speaking to us from the written page, and in a language, which by a sort of misnomer we call *dead*. But we shall have only an imperfect estimation of his power, until we have formed some adequate conception of what he *was*. We must cross the western and the midland oceans,—we must run up the stream of time two thousand years,—we must see the orator standing in the pride of his living power; and on the very scene of his immortal triumphs. A native of the small island of Seriphus once reproached Themistocles with deriving his greatness from that of his country. "It may be so," was the reply, "but thou could'st no more have been renowned at Athens, than I at Seriphus." The sentiment thus expressed is of universal application. Great talents may exist and be discoverable anywhere. But they can attain to the full measure of their greatness, only when Providence places them in a sphere of commensurate extent. Such a sphere, Demosthenes undoubtedly had.

It is well known that all the essential powers of the Athenian state were vested in the people. The government of Athens was to all intents an unmixed and unmitigated democracy. All matters, both of internal and external policy, all questions both of peace and war, were debated and decided in the popular assembly. The Athenians were a remarkable race;—a people of ardent temperament—and clear and active intellect. Perhaps no other community of equal extent has ever existed, so polished, so universally literary. Accustomed to constant attendance on dramatic exhibitions,—that faultless drama, which to this day is the unrivalled model of simplicity and beauty; living in an age and land, in which the fine arts, history, poetry and eloquence were carried to the very zenith of perfection, the

Athenians had become in all matters of taste and language, ingeniously acute, fastidiously critical. Prone to admiration, more prone to distrust; passionately devoted to war and glory—still more devoted to pleasure and ease; indolent, fickle, turbulent at home—when abroad, active, patient, brave; the Athenian character was a singular compound of good and evil. Such was the people whom Demosthenes addressed.

Let us enter their assembly. The place of meeting is an amphitheatre of vast extent. Its canopy is the open sky. In the rear, but high above them, towers the Acropolis, glorious with that architectural splendor, on whose crumbling relics we still gaze with the admiration of despair. Before them is the blue Ægean—their gallant navy riding by the shore, and in the distance, 'unconquered Salamis,' the scene of its early glory. On those stone-benches, are seated, within reach of a single speaker's eye and voice, an entire myriad of human beings,—met here on terms of perfect equality, to deliberate on the state of the nation. The civil and military power which they wield, is no other than that which once repelled the millions of Persia,—and which since, on a thousand hard-fought fields of intestine and of foreign war, has drawn around it all that sympathy which we naturally feel in brilliant success and unparalleled disaster. All feel it to be a scene of overwhelming interest. The moment is big with the fate of empires. On the decisions of the hour may depend the question, whether Athens shall longer be the eye of Greece, and glory of the world. Nay, more—freedom and slavery—national existence and national extinction may now be oscillating in the balance of Fate.

Philip of Macedon, an ambitious and able monarch, has long been aiming at the sovereignty of Greece. No means likely to effect his purpose have been left untried. One after another of the Grecian states has yielded to Macedonian arms, or arts, or gold. Athens alone was competent to resist the usurper. Moved by the threatening danger and the harangues of Demosthenes, more than once has she roused herself to action, and after checking the tyrant's career, sunk again into security. But intelligence has come of new and more alarming encroachments. Treaties have been violated; provinces overrun; cities in alliance conquered and

destroyed. The designs of the king are but too manifest—the danger is great and imminent. Already has the herald, according to custom, called on those who have any thing to offer in the present emergency, to come forward and give their advice. Already has age uttered its warning voice, and eloquence painted in glowing colors the magnitude and difficulty of a war with Philip. The timid, the prudent, and the venal, have united in magnifying the power and clemency of the monarch; in portraying the weakness of the republic, and in urging the necessity of conciliation and submission. There are evident indications that the advice is not unwelcome to the indolent and pleasure-loving sons of Athens.—Dares any, under these circumstances, offer a contrary opinion? Considering the fearful odds, and the great uncertainty, will any venture to propose a war with Philip, knowing that should the measure be adopted, and prove unsuccessful, the author of such advice may be put to death by the laws of his country? But lo! Demosthenes ascends the rostrum. Self-possessed, unassuming, yet conscious of his powers, it is his purpose to stem the tide which he sees advancing; to roll back the current; to operate, in other words, on this mighty mass of mind, and bend, and melt, and mould it to his own. He spends no breath in labored introduction, but enters at once on his subject. In terms of cutting severity, he chides the supineness and false security of his countrymen. Yet so unquestioned is his integrity; such the sincerity of his patriot ardor; so evidently good his motive, that he awakens no resentment, excites no feelings but those of shame. He allows, indeed, that much is lost, but much still remains. He suffers no despondence. He unfolds the resources of the state, and convinces his countrymen that nothing is even now needed but resolution and perseverance. Above all, he portrays with vivid brightness the injustice and the designs of Philip. The ambitious *monarch*, the unprincipled *man*, is set before us. Every winding of his crooked policy is unravelled; every latent motive set in the blaze of day. As he proceeds, indignation glows in every breast—quivers on the lip—kindles in the eye.

Finally, he calls up the images of the past. The earlier glories of Athens; the spirit of their fathers, who preferred death to ignominy; that renown, beyond the reach even of envy, which they won; the institutions which they bequeath-

ed, and the monuments of their taste and glory still clustering thick around, are touched with equal rapidity and power. One victory, at least, is gained—the victory of the orator. Ten thousand minds feel and acknowledge the mastery of *one*. Yet such is the charm of his eloquence, that they think not of *him*—they think not of *themselves*. High thoughts of country fill every soul. At his Caducean touch, irresolution and pusillanimity have vanished. Philip is no longer dreaded; the Macedonian phalanx is no longer invincible. Marathon and Platæa are before them. Mars once more wooes them to his fierce embrace, and Minerva, their own Minerva, marshals them to victory.

> The jarring States obsequious now
> View the Patriot's hand on high,
> Thunder gathering on his brow,
> Lightning flashing from his eye!
> Borne by the tide of words along,
> One voice, one mind, inspire the throng:
> To *arms!* to ARMS! to ARMS! they cry.
> Grasp the shield, and draw the sword,
> Lead us to Philippi's lord—
> Let us conquer him, or die!

In Rome, eloquence was a plant of late growth and of short duration. The art of persuasion could hardly expect the patronage of a people, who chose to convince all opponents *vi et armis*. It is a remarkable fact that the first public notice we have of any thing connected with our subject, is a decree of the Roman Senate passed in the 592d year of the Republic '*banishing* all philosophers and rhetoricians from Rome.' Such was the jealousy with which, at first, an unlearned and warlike people was disposed to regard those accomplishments of the subjugated Greeks, in which they could not but feel that the vanquished were superior to the victors. But this feeling gradually subsided, until at length rhetoric and oratory became elementary branches of a liberal education. It was unfortunate, perhaps, for *Roman* eloquence, that the instruction in these branches was long given by Greek Professors, and in the Grecian tongue. It was not until about the time of Cicero, that the Latin language had become sufficiently refined, and the general learning and taste of the nation sufficiently enlightened, to appreciate and encourage the higher efforts of oratorical art. With the patronage of fair opportunity, and under the com-

bined influence of freedom and taste, eloquence re-appeared in all her native beauty.

It is not a little remarkable that Roman eloquence like that of Greece, should have been illustrated by a single name, so transcendently brilliant, that in the effulgence, which surrounds it, predecessors and contemporaries seem merged and lost. If the fame of Demosthenes rests upon a *rock*, that of his great pupil has a substratum equally solid, and still broader, for his eloquence, learning and philosophy, have charmed and instructed countless thousands, to whom the orations of the former were but as a sealed book. "Cicero," it has sometimes and not extravagantly been said, "is only another name for *Eloquence*." And for what department of deep research and elegant literature *then* open to the human mind, is not Cicero another name? Where else shall we look for such a combination of all the elements of greatness? He was at once a rhetorician and orator—a philosopher and statesman—a man of profound erudition, and lively wit. He lived and died a spotless patriot--and both in precept and example, was only less than a *Christian* moralist.

These considerations must not be deemed out of place, though our object be to speak of Cicero as an *orator*. They suggest the main source of his acknowledged superiority. Others may have equalled or surpassed him possibly in *single* qualities, but who else ever drew the perennial streams of eloquence from a fountain so inexhaustible? He has indeed one great competitor, whose transcendent merits he has himself acknowledged and portrayed with equal candor and ability. The names of Cicero and Demosthenes have long been coupled, and must ever shine like twin stars in the sky. Yet, let us say it reverently, "they differ in glory." While Demosthenes is brief and compact, Cicero is almost always diffuse. With the former, ornament is rare, and of secondary consideration;—with the latter, abundant and evidently valued. Both abound in thought—but in one it is prominent and angular, like the muscular frame of Hercules, while in the other it is rotund and beautiful, as the Belvidere Apollo. Each makes use of consummate art: but while one conceals, the other displays it. The style of Demosthenes is nervous, that of Cicero flowing and graceful. The latter kindles the fancy—warms the passions—awakens the admi-

ration of his hearers—but the former, with a giant's grasp seizes their understandings and wills and bends them to his purpose. Both added to their powers as orators the knowledge and abilities of the statesman—as both administered for a time the government of their respective countries. In fine, to the Grecian orator we concede the superiority on great occasions—the spirit and the energy which could rouse a nation from apathy ; but for him of Rome, we claim a higher praise as the orator of *all* occasions—the delight and wonder of humanity.

The biography of both is replete with instruction and interest. Few men have lived who owed more to nature ; none, we may confidently say, who trusted less. Their great talents were surpassed by their greater industry. Natural impediments to success as speakers, which most men would have found insuperable, were encountered and overcome by both. By their eloquence mainly they raised themselves to the highest station in the state, and discharged their trusts with great ability and fidelity.

Not less remarkable were the periods in which they flourished. Those periods were crises in the affairs of their countries. It was their lot to be engaged in the last great struggle of free institutions with corruption and tyranny. It was their melancholy but high privilege to raise the last warning note of Freedom—to call and cheer her sons to the rescue—to fan with unavailing breath her flickering and expiring flame. But their mission came too late. The generous zeal, which could not prevent their countries' fall, hastened and ensured their own.

But who can estimate the debt which the world owes to their eloquent voices, and great example? How often have their tongues of fire roused the courage of their posthumous disciples—and their teachings pointed others to a victory, which their own eyes alas! were not permitted to behold! Who can tell how much of our own precious birthright of liberty and law is due to Demosthenes and Cicero? Had the frail manuscripts containing the writings of the free spirits of Greece and Rome *all* perished amid the damps and darkness of that long night, which settled on the world—had the vestal flame which in them still burns undimmed, been extinguished then; who can say that "the Promethean

heat, which could that light rekindle" had even *now* been found.

Civic eloquence disappeared with Cicero. In the courts of autocratic princes, she had no vocation, and during the ages of barbarism, which followed the downfall of Rome, her very name was forgotten. Even after the revival of letters, it was long before the vernacular languages of Europe had become sufficiently polished, or the taste of those communities where a good degree of freedom was enjoyed, such as to admit and encourage the exercise of this noble art. To call forth the highest efforts of oratory, a combination of important circumstances seems to be necessary. There must be, for instance, a general diffusion of knowledge and taste—the period must be one of stirring events—and there must be men of extraordinary abilities, ready to take advantage of the opportunity. Nay more—it is our belief, that the master-pieces of the art, are never produced, when it is known that the efforts of the orator are to perish with the occasion, or at most, to live only in the memories of those who hear them. In other words, great speeches will be made, only when there is a certainty of final publication. To prompt to the highest exertion of industry and talent, the orator requires, at least the prospect, of a wider field and a more lasting remembrance, than is to be found in the listless or the hungry ears, which fill the places of public business or resort. Anciently this want was met, in perhaps the best possible way; for it was the universal custom of Greek and Roman orators to write out and publish their speeches. The labor-saving propensities of modern ingenuity have devised an easier method of giving speeches to the world.

It seems necessary to take into view all these considerations, to account for the *late* development of modern eloquence. Notwithstanding the general intelligence of the British nation—the refinement of its great metropolis, and the concentration of talent in its House of Commons—nay, what is more, notwithstanding the freedom of speech and debate, which with few exceptions has been enjoyed in that body for two hundred years;—the era of *Parliamentary Eloquence* can be dated back no farther than the time of the elder Pitt. Regular reporting indeed did not begin until

after his day. All that we have of his speeches, we owe to the occasional and necessarily meagre sketches of members and spectators. Still the eloquence of Chatham formed an epoch in the annals of the art. No one familiar with the public and private memoirs of that period can doubt that he was the most effective *speaker* of modern times. But what was the secret of that efficiency? We contemplate with vain regret the scantiness of his remains, and the few materials we have for satisfying our curiosity. Yet even in these we find passages which give us a vivid sense of his ability; passages of more than Demosthenian fire, which must live as long as the language in which they were uttered. Still there is nothing to justify us in the belief that his speeches ever exhibited that broad, luminous, philosophical range of thought, which we find often in Cicero, and almost always in Burke. There can be no doubt that he was greatly indebted to his manner. In his exterior he lacked nothing which nature could give. We are told that he was in look and action, both graceful and dignified; but that dignity was the predominant feature. His countenance was wonderfully expressive. His eye, when directed in anger or scorn, had a penetrating and insufferable brightness, which most men found as difficult to meet, as they would to have gazed at the cloudless sun. His voice had great sweetness, power and variety of intonation, and was employed through its whole range, from the lowest whisper, distinctly audible, to its highest point of loudness and key, when it filled and electrified the house. His diction was simple and select, and he spared no pains to chasten and enrich it. Add now, to these advantages, his energy and weight of character, the universal impression of his immense talents, produced by his vigorous and successful administration, even more than by his oratorical efforts; and we may have some faint conception of what Chatham was, and shall wonder less, that "rebuked by the presence of higher qualities" pride and wealth, and rank, and power, quailed beneath the lightnings of his eye, and the thunders of his voice.

To our countrymen the fame of Chatham has always been dear. They had contributed to the triumphs and felt the benefits of his ministerial career. And when, at length, other counsels prevailed; when those colonies which he had fostered with a father's care became the objects of step-

motherly oppression; his mighty voice was still raised in their behalf. His was indeed a great and fortunate name; and we scarcely know that other which we would put in its place, in those beautiful and well-known words of his pious countryman:—

> "'Tis praise enough
> To fill the ambition of a common man,
> That Chatham's language was his mother tongue."

Ere the orb of Pitt went down another luminary had risen, which was destined at length to fill the skies and brighten earth with its prolific radiance. That Edmund Burke is by far the greatest name in the annals of modern eloquence, and in some important respects in those of *all* eloquence, is a position which few probably will controvert.

Had the claims of Burke rested only on that sort of merit which we have just conceded to Lord Chatham; had he left no other, or no more enduring memorials of his mind than Chatham left, his reputation would scarcely have survived to our time. He certainly was not remarkable for his powers of delivery. It was not by a commanding person, a flashing eye, or voice of thunder, that he gained his triumphs. Neither was *his* the gladiatorial skill of a great debater. In most of these particulars he was indeed respectable; but they are not the foundation of his fame;—a fame which, though long since severed from all these artificial aids, has continued to grow and to spread.

> "The blaze of eloquence
> Set with its sun; but still it left behind
> The enduring produce of immortal mind."

To great natural endowments this distinguished man added the stores of a profound and varied erudition. His imagination was brilliant and excursive. His taste was intuitively quick and correct. But the learning of Burke was not, like that of many, an inert and cumbrous load. It was something which he always carried with ease, and wielded with dexterity. At one time it was the rattling quiver of Apollo, from which he drew many a feathered shaft; at another, it was a battle-axe in his hands which would cleave the toughest skull.

Equally remarkable was the character of his imagination. This power with him was no wild sprite, playing fantastic

tricks only to amuse and dazzle; but the handmaid of reason—a creature as useful as she was beautiful. The ornament with which his diction abounds rarely fails to illustrate and to strengthen his argument. It is this which gives vivacity and richness to his style, without impairing its strength; a trait by which he is distinguished, and which he never sacrificed to less effective qualities. This property in Burke has not the severe simplicity of the Grecian master, nor the grace and flow of the great Roman model. It is rather a medium between the two; inferior in some respects, and in some superior to both. But the *distinguishing* excellence of Burke consists, undoubtedly, in the profound and comprehensive views which he brings to the discussion of his subjects. He seemed to be gifted with a deeper insight into the nature and tendencies of measures and events, than is allotted to common men. In his speeches and writings we are constantly meeting with general principles. Political science in his hands is no longer narrow and technical—a doctrine of mere expedients—for literature and philosophy, the testimony of experience and the teachings of common sense, all conspire to enhance its dignity, and to enforce its lessons.

Burke was the orator and teacher not of a day—not of a single nation, or his own age merely. His political and practical wisdom was based on the immutable foundation of truth and right. He had read, with intuitive eye and tenacious memory, the page of human nature, the book of Providence, and the library of universal history. To these sterling qualities of mind, he added unquestioned honesty of purpose, and a philanthropic heart. Who could be better fitted, or entitled to become the instructer of his race? And such he has become. To his works, as to an exhaustless storehouse of principles and reasoning, do the statesmen of England and America resort. And thither will they no doubt resort, until a greater than Burke shall appear among the Commons of Britain or in the halls of Congress.

But Mr. Burke may be said to have belonged to a Triumvirate of eloquence—the greatest, unquestionably, that ever divided among them the empire of mind. Mr. Fox, although a much younger man, entered on his Parliamentary career, nearly at the same time with Burke. For a while he was willing to rank as his disciple and follower; but in a few years his growing abilities—his great skill in debate—the

charm of his disposition and manners—and his superior political connexions, gave him the ascendency, and made him the acknowledged leader of the opposition ranks. When some twelve years later the youthful Pitt appeared upon the scene, he found those great men in full possession of the stage. The ease and suddenness with which he vaulted to the first place of honor and power, is well known. That he should succeed against *such* competition, was the strongest proof of talent he could give. At the age of twenty-three years, he had vanquished an opposing majority in the House of Commons, led by Fox and Sheridan and Burke—had won the nation to his side—and was wielding the destinies of the British empire.

> "See! with united wonder, cried
> The experienced and the sage,
> Ambition in a boy supplied
> With all the skill of age!
> Discernment, eloquence and grace
> Proclaim him born to sway"
> The sceptre "in the highest place
> And bear the palm away."

The oratory of Fox and Pitt was very unlike that of the great Triumvir already described. *Their* scene of glory was the arena of debate. Theirs was the skill and power acquired by the breaking of lances, by the parrying and giving of blows, in many a "passage of arms." More dexterous or powerful combatants never engaged in political warfare: a warfare maintained by them with scarce an intermission, for more than twenty years. The question of their comparative greatness it would be difficult to settle, but we can easily perceive that they were very unlike. Fox was persuasive, impetuous, powerful. To strong argument, and vehement appeal, he could add the lighter but often more effective weapons of ridicule and wit. Before his rushing charge, nothing, for the moment, could stand. But he was often incautious, and generally lacked that higher power, which is necessary to turn even victory to account. His antagonist had far more dignity, vigilance and prudence. He could never be thrown from his guard. He was lofty and fluent, but not impassioned; sarcastic, but not witty. The conflict of these rival statesmen was often that of Roderick Dhu and Snowdown's knight. The giant strength and fiery valor of the highland chief are wasted on the air.—

But "Fitz James' blade is sword and shield." Even the personal qualities of the two men, influenced probably in some degree the judgments, which were formed of their eloquence. Who can doubt that Mr. Fox would have been even more admired, and trusted, and beloved, if to his winning manners, and brilliant powers, he had added the virtuous circumspection of his illustrious rival.

Associated with Burke and Fox, in their long career of opposition, was the renowned, unhappy Sheridan. If not, as he has been called, "the worthy rival," he might doubtless in many respects have been the rival

> "Of the wondrous three,
> Whose words were sparks of immortality."

Sheridan had not the classical attainments, nor the political and general information of his great contemporaries. He could not generalize with Burke, nor debate with Pitt and Fox. But his flow of wit was inexhaustible. On great occasions, and with sufficient preparation, he could put forth the highest powers of oratory. A richer tribute was perhaps never paid to eloquence, than was universally accorded to him after his great speech on the Begum charge in the trial of Hastings;

> "In whose acclaim the loftiest voices vied,
> The praised, the proud, who made his praise their pride."

Ah! what availed those coruscations of wit and eloquence, but to cast a melancholy splendor around his tarnished fame! Ah! why did he rise to such heights of renown, only to fall with wider ruin!

More than a quarter of a century has elapsed since the tongues of Burke, and Fox, and Pitt, became silent in death. But on none of their successors does the mantle of their high commission seem to have fallen. England has had, indeed, and still has, able statesmen, respectable orators. Grattan was ardent and patriotic; Wilberforce was as pleasing as he was good; Canning was classical, witty, and felicitous; Mackintosh was sage and dignified, and Brougham is learned, logical, and sarcastic. But though we might go on still farther in our enumeration, we must still assert in regard to them all, as was said of King David's thirty captains,—none of them "attain unto the first three."

But it is time to ask, whose are the great names of *American* eloquence? *Whom* will posterity regard as the Demosthenes or Burke of our age and republic? Surely if facilities and opportunities for public speaking—with daily and nightly practice conjoined, are sufficient to make great orators, our country must be the most prolific region under the sun.

Aside from the pulpit and the bar, we have neither record nor tradition of American eloquence, anterior to the disputes with the mother country. These furnished the exciting theme—and popular assemblies the most ample scope for the first orators of freedom. This was the era of Quincy, Warren, Otis, Henry and the Adamses. Of the effect produced by their impassioned harangues, we have abundant evidence—but the harangues themselves are, for the most part, lost for ever. We know not that this is to be regretted. Their unpolished though vigorous eloquence was adapted to the times, and accomplished its objects—but had it been faithfully preserved it might have offended our more fastidious ears. The vital interests involved—the magnitude of the danger—the intense feelings of an excited community, produced a sympathy with the orator, which we could not fully realize, thus in the estimation of his hearers, redeeming his vehemence from the charge of extravagance.

But now the medium through which we behold them is misty and dim. Time and distance have surrounded them with a haze of glory. We wish in this case no clearer vision, for what the eye cannot discover, fancy will supply.

With the adoption of the Federal Constitution, and the organization of the government the parliamentary eloquence of our country may be said to have commenced. Systematized opposition and combined party action then first applied the stimulus to debate,—a stimulus which seems to lose none of its irritating properties by the lapse of time. Were we called upon to select from the great and good, who figured at that time in our national councils, the two highest names on the rolls of eloquence, those names would be Alexander Hamilton and Fisher Ames. Our opinion of Hamilton's eloquence must rest mainly on the testimony of those who heard him. His speeches as they have come to us, do not correspond with our impressions of his remarkable powers. Great and eloquent beyond most, if not all

men of his day, he certainly was, if we may believe the concurrent statements of friends and foes.

Of the powers of Mr. Ames we have more satisfactory memorials. His eloquence is generally flowing and delightful,—rising at times to passages of great power and pathos,—and conveyed always in a diction remarkably correct, terse and beautiful. Like Burke, he is distinguished by philosophic and comprehensive views. Such is the skill with which he draws from human nature, and from history, his lessons of political wisdom, that his orations and writings are as instructive as they are pleasing. Hence he is one of the few writers, whom we read with interest, long after the occasions and the excitements, which called them forth, have for ever passed away.

We will not, by a bare enumeration, (and time would allow no more,) do injustice to the many respectable, and the few brilliant orators, whose names appear in our Legislative and Congressional annals. Let us then at once ask, Which is our trio of great names? Who are the men who have been allowed to seize and decide the triumviral honors of American eloquence? Whom would the candid, united sense of this wide empire, select as its ablest men, from among those, who for the last quarter of a century, have swayed its councils? "Of the three hundred,' name 'but *three*." For whom, on entering for the first time the Senate chamber of the nation, does the stranger, whether native or foreign, soonest inquire? Inquire! Nay, the pen and the pencil, and wide-mouthed Fame have made the inquiry needless. How soon his eye recognizes the features; how soon his whisper breathes the illustrious names of Webster, Clay, Calhoun!

In contemplating the qualities of these extraordinary individuals, we are again struck with the fact, that men may be eminently great and yet eminently dissimilar.

Mr. Calhoun is the acknowledged chief of metaphysical orators. His mind is uncommonly acute, with a rare faculty of seeing or making distinctions. His reasoning is equally subtle and plausible. He loves to revel and soar in the airy regions of abstraction. He is the great Des Cartes of the Political Academy. His theory is always curious—often beautiful—sometimes sublime; but it is a theory of "vortices." The course of his political fortunes may have

affected unconsciously the hues of his mind, for his views are often sombre, and his anticipations of the future ominous and foreboding.

Not so with Mr. Clay. He loves to move on the surface of our earth, and amid the throng of fellow men:—or if at any time disposed to climb, 'tis only to some sunny hill-top, that he may get a wider view of the busy, happy scene below. He is the orator of popular principles and common sense. His views are expansive, rather than deep—his grasp of subject not so strong as it is broad. He needs no interpreter to make more clear his meaning, nor any other index to the kindness of his character, than his homely, but open and expressive face. As a speaker, his style is Ciceronean; graceful and winning, rather than impetuous. Witty, and prompt at repartee, he is more skilful and ready in the skirmish of debate, than either of his great competitors.

One remains. In all the qualities of the orator and statesman, fitted to confer present power and lasting fame, Mr. Webster's pre-eminence will be denied by few. In him we behold a mind of great native vigor; early roused to energy by the very necessities of his early origin;—disciplined to habits of severe thought by the laborious study of law;—trained in all the arts of intellectual warfare on the hard arena of forensic strife; and finally expanded to its present mighty range of eloquence, philosophy, and statesmanship, on the broad and stirring theatre of the public councils. Those who have heard Mr. Webster, are well aware that he owes a portion of his power to personal advantages. The lofty brow, the dark and cavernous eye, and the heavy, deep-toned voice might alone enchant a gazing auditory. These impart to his calmer and ordinary discourse, a serious earnestness, and a senatorial dignity; but in moments of high excitement, by no means of frequent occurrence, they seem like the blackness, and fire, and rolling peals of the o'er-charged and bursting cloud.

His style is remarkable for its simplicity. To utter thoughts of the highest order, in language perfectly simple; by lucid arrangement and apt words, to make abstract reasoning, and the most recondite principles of commerce, politics, and law, plain to the humblest capacity, is a privilege and power, in which Mr. Webster is equalled, probably, by no living man. This simplicity, which is apt to be thought

so easy of attainment, is, nevertheless, in this as in most cases, undoubtedly the result of uncommon care. Like the great Athenian orator, Mr. Webster is always full of his subject. Like him, when most simple in his diction, he is yet admirably select. Like him too, he can adorn where ornament is appropriate, and kindle, when occasion calls, into the most touching pathos, or loftiest sublime.

As a public man, Mr. Webster is eminently American. His speeches breathe the purest spirit of a broad and generous patriotism. The institutions of learning and liberty, which nurtured him to greatness, it has been his filial pride to cherish :—his manly privilege to defend, if not to save. In no emergency, on no occasion, where he has yet been tried, have the high expectations formed of his abilities, been doomed to disappointment. The time-honored Rock of the Pilgrims ; Bunker's glorious mound ; and old Faneuil Hall ; have been rendered even more illustrious by his eloquent voice. Armed at all points, and ready alike for attack and defence, he has been found equally great, whether wrestling with champions of the Law, before its most august tribunal, or contending on the broader field, and in the hotter conflicts of Congressional warfare. We cannot say that it is matter of regret to us, that he is no longer a candidate for office, though that office be *deemed* the highest. The Senate,—the Senate—is undoubtedly his true sphere of benificence and glory. There may he long be found, foremost amid the mighty names, which are at once our crown of pride, and tower of strength.

ARTICLE V.

CHRISTOLOGY OF THE BOOK OF ENOCH;

With an account of the Book itself, and Critical Remarks upon it.

By M. Stuart, Prof. of Sac. Lit. in the Theol. Seminary at Andover.

THE time has been, when the deepest interest was felt among the Literati of Europe, in respect to the book named at the head of this communication. Hidden treasures are generally sought for with great avidity; but when brought to light, and cupidity or curiosity has been satisfied, the interest in them is very apt to subside.

During the earliest ages of the Christian church, the book of Enoch was well known, and, as it would seem, stood among many in high repute. Even a canonical writer of the New Testament, viz. Jude the author of an Epistle, appears to have quoted from it. At least this has generally been so understood, both in ancient and in modern times. That the reader may judge for himself, as to the probability of this, I will place the passage from both the writings in question before him.

Jude vs. 14, 15.	Enoch, Chap. II.
"And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying: Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of their ungodly deeds, which they have committed, and of all their hard *speeches*, which ungodly sinners have spoken against him."	"Behold he comes with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon them, and destroy the wicked, and reprove all the carnal, for every thing which the sinful and ungodly have done and committed against him."

The question, whether Jude has actually quoted the book of Enoch, is one, indeed, about which there has been, in modern times, some diversity of opinion. In the sequel I may resume the consideration of it, after some account of this book has been given. For the present it may suffice to remark, that the ancients, who were acquainted with the so

called *Book of Enoch*, seem to have been almost or quite unanimous in maintaining the affirmative of this question. The *Testament of the twelve Patriarchs* refers to it as γραφὴ Ἐνώχ, βίβλος Ἐνώχ, γραφὴ νόμου Ἐνώχ, γραφὴ ἁγία Ἐνώχ (with some variation of Mss. as to the reading ἁγία), and λόγος Ἐνώχ. Tertullian, in defending the authenticity of this writing, says: "Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet;" De Hab. Mulieb. cap. 2. Jerome, in speaking of Jude's epistle as one of the books which was rejected by some, says, that it was thus rejected, "quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est, in ea [sc. epistolâ] assumit testimonium," Catal. Script. Ecc. c. 4; i. e. it was rejected because Jude quotes the apocryphal book of Enoch. Again, the same writer in his Comm. in Epist. ad Titum, c. I., speaking of the book of Enoch says: "De quo Judas in epistolâ suâ testimonium posuit." And finally, Augustine (de Civ. Dei, XV. 23) says: "That Enoch, the seventh from Adam, wrote some divine things, we can not deny, cum hoc in epistolâ canonicâ Judas apostolus dicat." In the same work (Lib. XVIII. cap. 38) he says: "Nonne etiam in canonicâ epistolâ apostoli Judæ prophetasse prædicatur?"

Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Anatolius (Alexand.), and Hilary, all of whom refer to the book before us and quote from it, say nothing which goes to establish the idea, that any Christians of their day denied or doubted that a quotation was made by the apostle Jude from the book of Enoch. Several, and in fact most, of these writers do indeed call in question the *canonical* rank or authority of the book of Enoch; but the apologies which they make for the quotation of it by Jude, shew that the quotation itself was, as a matter of fact, generally conceded among them.

At all events, most persons who compare the two passages, as above cited, will be spontaneously inclined, at first view, to the same opinion that was embraced by the ancient fathers. The contrary of this can never be made out, perhaps, with satisfactory certainty. And while such is the case, it becomes a matter of deep interest, to know something particular about a book, on which so much honour was apparently bestowed by the apostle Jude.

After the time of Jerome, we find very little said concerning the book of Enoch, until the eighth century. Near the close of this, Georgius Syncellus, a monk of Constantinople

(fl. 790), in a work entitled *Chronography from Adam to Diocletian*, made large extracts from what he names *the first Book of Enoch*. These were first published by Joseph Scaliger, in his notes to the *Chronicus Canon* of Eusebius, at Paris in 1652, and at Amsterdam in 1658. The whole of these extracts are also reprinted, in a beautiful manner, in Dr. Laurence's English translation of the book of Enoch, 1st edit. 1821, 2nd edit. 1832. They may also be found in Fabricius' Codex Pseudep. Vet. Test. Vol. I. p. 179 seq. They shew, beyond all reasonable question, that the book of Enoch, which was quoted by Syncellus, was the same book for substance which now lies before us in an English version; at least, so far as the quotations proceed they shew this, while the quotations made by other ancient writers serve the purpose of proving the same thing in regard to the book of Enoch in general; as we shall see in the sequel.

The latest mention that is made of the book of Enoch, as extant and well known in former times, is that of Nicephorus, a patriarch of Constantinople (fl. Cent. IX.); who, in his *List of Canonical and Uncanonical Books*, inserted at the close of his *Chronographiæ Compendium*, mentions the book of Enoch as belonging to the latter class, and assigns, for the measure or extent of the book, 4800 στίχοι. This would seem to correspond very well with the extent of the book as it now lies before us.

From the time of Nicephorus down to the period when Scaliger published an edition of Syncellus, nothing of consequence appears to have been either said or known respecting the book of Enoch. But the large extracts of very curious matter which Syncellus had made, and which were now published, soon awakened a lively sensation throughout Europe, in regard to that ancient work. Scaliger himself spoke in very disparaging terms of the book, so far as it was disclosed to him by Syncellus; although he maintains that the apostle Jude has quoted it. After him, Grotius, Cave, Grabe, Walton, Simon, Pfeiffer, Witsius, Drusius, Ludolf, Hottinger, Van Dale, Buddæus, Heber, and others, wrote more or less respecting the book of Enoch; most of them saying many things which are not worth perusal now, since the discovery and publication of the book itself.

At one time in the 17th century, strong hopes were entertained, that the book had been discovered in the Ethiopic

language ; for there seems, from some cause not now known, to have existed at that period an apprehension, that the book was still extant in the Ethiopic. A monk from Egypt, by name Ægidius Lochiensis, assured the famous N. C. F. Peiresc of Pisa, that he had seen the book in the Ethiopic language. Peiresc, at a great expense and with much effort, at length obtained possession of the book which had been thus described. Ludolf, the famous Ethiopic scholar, afterwards visited the Royal Library at Paris where it was deposited, in order to examine it ; but he found the volume which Peiresc had so dearly obtained, to be nothing more than a worthless tract, replete with fable and superstition.

From this time all hopes of obtaining the book seem to have died away throughout Europe. Many things were said, here and there, and many conjectures indulged, respecting it ; but it was generally supposed, that it must be ranked among the books irrecoverably lost.

Accident, so to speak, at last gave to Europe, what ages and generations had sought for in vain. A little more than half a century ago, James Bruce, the well known traveller in Abyssinia, published a copious account of that country, of which very little was then known in Europe. Bruce staid in Abyssinia during nearly six years, made himself in a good degree familiar with the language of the country, which is Ethiopic for substance, and brought home with him a large collection of curious and interesting objects. Among these were three copies, in Ethiopic, of the long sought for book of Enoch. It holds a place in the Canon of the Abyssinian or Ethiopic Scriptures, and *is arranged immediately before the book of Job.* One copy was presented by Bruce to the Royal Library at Paris; another to the Bodleian Library at Oxford ; while a third was reserved for his own use.

The report from France of the reception of such a present was spread abroad, and reached England before it was known there that one of its own libraries was enriched with the like treasure. The famous antiquarian and Egyptian scholar, the late Dr. Woide, librarian of the British Musæum, immediately obtained letters, from the then Secretary of State, to the English Ambassador at the Court of Paris, requesting him to assist the zealous librarian in procuring a copy of the Paris manuscript of the book of Enoch.

This was accomplished, and Dr. Woide brought back the copy to England; where it remained among his papers, until his death. Bruce states, that Dr. W. *translated* the Ethiopic MS. at Paris; but Dr. Laurence assures us that this is a mistake, inasmuch as no such translation has been found among the papers of Dr. W., all of which came into the hands of the Delegates of the University Press at Oxford. The book of Enoch was merely *transcribed* by Dr. W., and that somewhat imperfectly. It was not translated; nor does it appear that Dr. W. was competent to the task.

Zeal for the cause of this long sought relic of antiquity appears to have expired for a long time in England, along with the librarian of the British Musæum. In France the Book of Enoch scarcely awakened a sensation; for the horrors of the revolution and its sequel exclusively occupied the public mind there, for a long period. Recently, however, in England, Dr. Laurence, the present Archbishop of Cashell, and late Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford, turned his attention, while at the University, to the study of the Ethiopic; and, as the fruits of this, he brought before the world a translation of the Book of Enoch into the English language, in 1821. A new edition of this work appeared at Oxford in 1832, somewhat corrected and enlarged.

The reader may desire to know something more of the history of the other two Mss. of the Book of Enoch, brought from Abyssinia by Mr. Bruce. The copy at Paris remained unnoticed, until the late learned De Sacy, of the Oriental School in Paris, translated a part of it into Latin, viz. chap. vi.—xvi., also chapters xxii. and xxxi., which he published in the *Magazin Encyclopedique*, Tom. I. p. 382, seq. Mr. Murray, the editor of the octavo edition of Bruce's Travels, has given, in a note to that edition, a brief and very imperfect summary of the contents of the Book of Enoch, made from the copy that was deposited in the library of Mr. Bruce. To Dr. Laurence belongs the honour of revealing to the world the treasure that had been hidden for so many ages, and which was almost universally supposed to be lost irrecoverably.

Dr. L. has prefixed to his translation a *Preliminary Dissertation*, in which he has given a brief account of the literature of the book, and made some very acute and sensible

remarks on various topics of interest in respect to it, particularly in regard to the time and place of its composition and the author of the work. He has thus made a beginning which does him great honour; but the present state of criticism is such, that something may be, and ought to be, added to what he has accomplished.

In 1833 about one half of the Book of Enoch was published in Germany, translated into German from the version of Dr. Laurence, by A. G. Hoffmann, Professor of Theology at the University of Jena. It is accompanied by an ample apparatus of notes and explanations, in the usual style of the Germans, exhibiting the fruits of extensive research and knowledge, and making much, which is in itself obscure to a modern reader of the book in question, to become quite plain and intelligible. The work of Hoffmann extends to the 55th chapter, and constitutes a moderate-sized octavo. Whether the learned Commentator has completed his whole design, I have not yet been able to ascertain. In the mean time, he who desires to go thoroughly into an examination of the spirit and manner of the Book of Enoch, will find important aid from the Notes of Dr. Hoffmann.

In addition to the literature already laid before the reader, I may add, for the sake of inquiring critics, that some valuable remarks and criticisms upon the work, by De Sacy, may be found in the *Journal des Savans*, 1822, Oct. Art. II.; also an excellent *critique* upon the same, in Lücke's Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis, § 12, p. 52 seq.

Having thus put the reader in possession of the general outlines of the literary history of the Book of Enoch, and pointed out the means by which he may acquire a particular knowledge of the work and whatever pertains to it, it seems proper, in the next place, to present him with a sketch of the *contents of the book itself*. The possession of this work, in our country, is rare; and our public, so far from being acquainted with the contents of the work, are in general not at all aware, as I have reason to believe, that the book has even been recovered and published to the world.

The *general plan* of the book of Enoch may be described in a few words. Enoch the seventh from Adam, who was translated because "he walked with God," is represented as the author of the work, and is introduced, nearly throughout the book, as speaking in the *first* person. The

work itself consists of a series of so-called visions and revelations made to Enoch by angels; bearing a close resemblance, in this respect, to the general manner of the Apocalypse. The writer is sometimes addressed by angels, while in a state of extasy; sometimes he is caught up by them into the heavenly regions, and conducted to all the different parts of the universe, so as to take a survey of the whole. What he saw and heard, during these visions and extasies, is related by him in a series of compositions, several of which have no very apparent connection with other parts of the work, either as to general object, or particular design. The *unity* of the work, as it now lies before us, is at least a very questionable trait; and, at all events, it can be made out only on grounds which are quite generic.

The general object of the writer is, to exhibit *the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked.* He begins with the apostate angels; and after exhibiting their fall and punishment, he proceeds to explain the secrets of the universe as to the phenomena of winds, storms, cold, heat, thunder, lightning, the motions of the heavenly bodies, their changes and evolutions, etc. He then returns to the theme of the punishment of the wicked and the reward of the righteous, which is pursued through three long *parables*, as he calls them. The astronomical system of the author is next introduced, and dwelt upon through eleven chapters. Then comes a section respecting the flood and some prophetic anticipations of it. The whole is closed by hortatory addresses of Enoch to all his descendants, on the general subject of the rewards of virtue and the punishment of the wicked, specially of persecutors.

There reigns, through most of the work, a deep sense in the writer's mind of injury from the persecution and malice of the wicked. One cannot doubt, that the book must have been written in a time of persecution for piety's sake; for, like the Apocalypse, it ever and anon brings to view this subject, and utters tremendous threatenings against the enemies and persecutors of the righteous. Who the author must have been, and whether the persecution was that which vexed Jews or Christians, will be a subject of inquiry in the sequel.

Such is the *general* outline and object of the book. But the reader, who is not in possession of it, and may not be able to

procure it, will naturally be desirous to know something more particular respecting so curious and interesting a relic of antiquity; and for his sake I shall proceed to give a more enlarged summary of its contents.

In imitation of the prophecies of the Old Testament, the work commences with a title, which exhibits the [declared] author and object of the book. It runs thus: "The word of the blessing of Enoch, how he blessed the elect and the righteous, who were to exist in the time of trouble, rejecting all the wicked and the ungodly. Enoch, a righteous man, who was with God, answered and spoke, while his eyes were open, [i. e. while in a waking trance], and while he saw a holy vision in the heavens. This the angels shewed me."

The author then proceeds in the *first* person instead of the third: "From them *I* heard all things, and understood what *I* saw, that which will not take place in this generation, but in a generation which is to succeed in a distant period, on account of the elect."

The reader by comparing this with Rev. 1: 1, will see that the angels are here represented as being employed in making prophetic disclosures to Enoch, just as they are in that book. He will see, also, in this introduction to the work, that *the righteous who were to exist in a time of trouble*, are the special objects of the writer's communications: and that *the rejection of the wicked* is blended with this, in the general aim of the writer.

The sum of what follows in the first chapter* is, that 'God will hereafter reveal himself on earth; all shall be filled with terror; the earth shall be burned up, and all things in it perish; but to the righteous peace and mercy shall be given; they shall all be blessed, and the glory of God shall shine upon them.'

Then follows, in Chapter ii., the passage which the apostle Jude is supposed to have quoted, and which has been exhibited at the beginning of the present communication.

The reflecting reader will see, in these sentiments, the germ of a *millennial day*. He may be doubtful after read-

* The work is divided into 105 *chapters*, with more or less verses, in the manner of our canonical Scriptures.

ing the first chapter only, whether the writer means to allude to happiness in the heavenly world, or in the present one; but other parts of his work make it plain, that he expected, like the pious in general of his day, a future ἀποκατάστασις, [Acts 3: 21], a *restitution* of all things, when there should be a "new earth in which would dwell righteousness."

The author then proceeds: 'All nature obeys, without transgressing, the ordinances of its Maker. The stars, the clouds, the seasons, the trees, rivers, and seas, all obey their appropriate laws. Only the wicked disobey; and on them shall be no peace, but eternal curses. To the righteous, however, shall be given light, peace, joy, wisdom, freedom from condemnation, long life, and everlasting happiness.'* Chap. iii—vi.

Such is the general introduction of the writer to his work. He next proceeds to relate the sin and fall of the apostate angels, as preparatory to the message which he receives to be communicated to them. This occupies Chap. vii—x.

'A number of angels, (according to chap. 7: 7, they were 200), become enamoured with some of the beautiful daughters of the sons of men, and, by the persuasion of Samyaza their leader, they enter into an agreement, sanctioned by mutual oath on mount Hermon, to cohabit with them. This agreement they actually carry into execution, teaching their paramours, at the same time, sorcery, divination, the arts of luxury and ornamental dress; also of fabricating dyes, jewels, and instruments of war. These women, in the sequel, gave birth to giants [נְפִילִים] 300 cubits high, who devoured all the productions of man which were fitted for food, and at last fell upon men themselves.' Chap. vii. viii. 'The good guardian angels of men now make their complaint to the Almighty, on account of this outrage. An angel is immediately sent by the Most High to Noah, in order to foretell the deluge which would come upon the earth. Raphael is also commissioned to bind Azazyel, one of the leading apos-

* Where a single comma is employed it is the sign of summary abridgment, made as nearly in the style of the original as the case will permit; where double commas are employed, exact quotation is designated.

tate angels, hand and foot, and cast him into darkness, and into the desert Dudael. The earth is threatened with punishment for its wickedness, but it will not be utterly destroyed. Gabriel is commissioned to go and excite the giants, the mongrel breed of angels and women, to mutual slaughter. Michael is commanded to go and seize Samyaza, with his apostate fellows, and bind them for 70 generations under the earth, even to the day of judgment; and also to complete the destruction of the giants.' Ch. ix—x. 1 . . . 20. Then follows (x. 21 . . . 29) a description of a millennial state, which is to succeed the destruction of the wicked. 'Righteousness and equity shall abound; the earth will yield, in overflowing abundance, all that ministers to want and even luxury; the saints will live and beget each a *thousand* children; all men will be righteous, all will worship God in truth; all crime will cease; no more shall there be any deluge; and every thing in which men shall engage, will be blessed.'

These things being narrated, the writer now goes on to give an account of his own commission to announce to the apostate angels their doom. 'This commission he executes, and they all become terrified and beseech him to intercede for them. He consents, and writes down a memorial for them; but while he is reading it he falls asleep, and is taught by a vision, that their doom admits of no change.' The substance of his vision is as follows: 'The prophet is caught up into heaven, where he sees a spacious palace, surrounded by crystal walls and vibrating flames of fire, and guarded by fiery Cherubim. On a throne therein, which was surrounded with blazing splendour, one great in glory sat, on whom even angels could not look without being dazzled.' Chap. xii—xiv. 'By the exalted Being on this throne, Enoch is commissioned to go and assure the apostate angels of their doom. The crime which they have committed is against the laws of their spiritual nature, and it admits of no pardon. The giants, their ill-begotten progeny, shall beget only evil demons; who will commit all kinds of violence and oppression, and shall miserably perish, at last, by mutual slaughter. No mercy can be obtained for them. Their flesh shall perish before the judgment that will come upon them, and until the consummation of all things. No peace

can ever be given to apostate angels, or to their offspring.' Chap. xv—xvi.

Thus concludes the *first* part of the book of Enoch; and with it, in the main, ceases a special reference to the case of the apostate angels. It is probable that this portion of the work constituted the *first Book*, in the time of Syncellus; as his citations are from this part of it, and he marks them as taken ἐκ βιβλίου πρώτου.

The SECOND BOOK seems to extend from chap. xvii. to chap. xxxv. 'The prophet represents himself as elevated to the top of a lofty mountain, in some distant region, whence he sees the treasuries of lightning and thunder, the fiery ocean in which the sun sets [to rekindle his beams], and the rivers of fire which empty into it, [in order to supply it with fresh material]. He sees also the mountains of gloom whence winter issues, and the great abyss which is the source of all the streams and rivers of water. He is also made to behold the treasuries of the winds, which are agents [according to his view] in causing all the motions of the heavenly bodies. All these he finds situated in the *West*.' Chap. xvii—xviii. 1...8.

'He now passes on to the *South*. Here are six mountains, formed of shining and precious stones, and blazing with fire. On the other side of them he beholds an extended desert, with a great lake and fountains of water. Over these fountains columns of fire are standing, which move up and down; over them is no firmament, and under them no solid ground. Here *seven stars* are imprisoned, [must he not mean the *guardian angels* of the stars?] which had transgressed the command of God, and had not kept their appointed courses. Here too is the place, where the apostate angels first chose their leaders in the matter of their transgression; and afterwards the same angels led men astray into idolatry and other crimes, for which they will be judged.' Chap. xviii—xix.

'Passing on nearer to this tremendous place, the Seer asks his angel interpreter to explain the ground of that severe punishment which the seven stars suffered. He answers, that they had transgressed their laws.' Chap. xxi. 1—3.

[Is it not manifest here, that the writer, like Origen and several of the early Fathers, believed the stars either to be

animated beings, or at least that they were under the direction and management of animated and angelic beings? Hence the guilt with which they are charged. The bearing of this on the writer's general object seems to be, a design to impress his readers with a dread of transgressing the laws of God.]

'Going thence, the angel conducts Enoch to a dreadful place, glittering with columns of fire, which he declares to be the prison of the sinning [apostate] angels.' Chap. xxi. 4—6.

'Thence he proceeds to the *region of the blessed.* This is surrounded by mighty walls of rock. Hither the souls of the dead, i. e. of all the righteous, will come, and dwell until the day of judgment. [The *intermediate* heaven of the New Testament writers, also, differs plainly from the *final* one]. This place is divided into four spaces, by a *chasm* between the first and the second, [comp. Luke 16: 26], water between the second and the third, and light between the third and the fourth.'

'In like manner the souls of the wicked, in their place after death, are separated until the judgment day, [different gradations of misery, as well as of happiness]; when they will be punished for ever. There is no escape from their prison.' Chap. xxii.

Enoch now returns toward the West again. There he sees a running fire, blazing night and day without cessation. On inquiry the angel-interpreter tells him, that this fire is that of all the luminaries of heaven;' [i. e. that it is designed to furnish them with fresh supplies, when they have set in the West.]

'Thence the prophet is rapt into another place, where he sees seven shining mountains, adorned with precious stones and with odoriferous trees, one of which exceeded all the trees of Eden. The fruit of this tree will be given to the righteous after the judgment [comp. Rev. 22: 2], and they will live for ever by means of it, free from all pain and sorrow. On the seventh of these mountains, overtopping all the rest, the Lord of Glory will descend, when he shall visit the earth in order to reward the righteous.' Chap. xxiv.

'Thence the prophet comes to the middle of the earth [Jerusalem], where he sees a holy mountain [Zion], with water on the eastern side flowing to the south [the brook

Kidron]; also another mountain [that of Olives] on the east. Water also ran from the West [from the fountain of Siloam], and another mountain was on the south, [which is matter of fact in respect to Jerusalem and its vicinity]. Among these were vallies and precipices with trees; also an accursed valley, [viz. the valley of Hinnom]. Here blasphemies are punished; and in the judgment they shall be made an example of retribution.' Chap. xxv. xxvi.

'From this place Enoch is carried to a mountain in the desert [Sinai?], full of trees, water, and cataracts; thence to another place eastward of this, which was full of choice odoriferous and medicinal trees; from this station he sees another place with plenty of living water and goodly trees; then he beholds another mountain containing trees loaded with the most sweet smelling fruit, and from this mountain flowed water like to nectar [nekotro]. On this mountain rested another, full of trees with fruit of ravishing odour.' Chap. xxvii—xxx.

'Thence, surveying "the entrances of the *north*," he perceived seven other mountains replete with nard and odoriferous trees. Passing these, and going over the Erythraean Sea, far beyond it he beheld the garden of righteousness [Eden], with trees numerous, large, beautiful, fragrant, and among them the tree of knowledge, like to a species of tamarind tree. Raphael tells him, that this is the tree of which his ancient progenitors ate.' Chap. xxxi.

'Thence he is conducted "toward the extremities of the earth," where large beasts and birds of various forms are seen; to the eastward of these he comes to "the ends of the earth and heavens," and there he sees the gates of heaven open, whence issued all the stars. By the help of his guide he numbered and recorded all these, together with their times and seasons. Thence he goes to the extremities of the north, where he sees the gates whence issue the northern winds, cold, hail, frost, dew, and rain. Thence he is taken to the gates at the western extremity, and thence to those of the southern one, from which issue dew, rain, and wind. Thence he goes back again to the east, in order to review the courses of the stars.' Chap. xxxiv—xxxv.

Here begins another and a different portion of the work.

The author entitles it: "The *second* vision of wisdom which Enoch saw, the son of Jared, the son of Malaleel, the son of Enos, the son of Seth, the son of Adam." He represents himself as having received from the Lord of spirits "the word of wisdom . . . . in a hundred and three parables." Chap. xxxvii. Of these only *three* appear in the sequel. De Sacy, on this account, thinks that the text should be changed so as to read *three;* but it is manifest that the book comes to us in a mutilated and disturbed state, and from some of the quotations made by ancient writers, a part of the book appears to have perished, or to have been omitted in the Ethiopic copies. We cannot, therefore, pronounce with certainty in respect to this matter.

The three parables that follow, constitute by far the most interesting and important part of the book. In these the whole of the author's *Christology* is developed. I shall at present, therefore, present a summary of only such parts as do not contain the Christology, reserving this for a subsequent and distinct consideration.

Parable the First. 'The time of judgment, and of the separation between the righteous and the wicked, is coming; when endless woe will be to the wicked, but peace and happiness to the righteous. "The holy and elect race shall descend from the upper heavens," and they shall dwell with men. [Does he mean that the Saviour and his angels shall descend and dwell with men on earth, or only that the saints in heaven will again dwell on earth? Probably the latter; inasmuch as he says, "their *seed* shall dwell with men"]. Chap. xxxviii. xxxix.

'The Seer is now taken up into heaven, where he sees the habitation of the saints with the angels. Their number is countless, and they continually bless and praise God. Earnestly does Enoch desire to remain there. Myriads stand before the Lord of spirits, and on the four sides of him are four archangels, who address him in different ways, praise him, and supplicate for success in discharging the different tasks assigned them.' Chap. xxxix. xl.

'The secret places of Paradise are next shewn to Enoch, and there he sees the receptacles of the various agents in nature, viz. the thunder, wind, dew, hail, etc.; also of the moon with all her phases, and of the stars with all their

phenomena. These last shine with no changing or borrowed light, [i. e. they are fixed stars]. Chap. xli—xliv.

PARABLE THE SECOND. This seems to extend from Chap. xlv. to liii. 6; and here the Christology of the book has a leading place. I pass by these chapters, therefore, for the present, and advert for a moment to the contents of chap. liii. 7—lv.

These appear to be out of due order in this place, and are plainly an interruption of the second parable. Chap. liii. 7—liv. 1—8, contain an account or prediction of the flood, and of the punishment inflicted on the apostate angels and their paramours and offspring, which would seem to belong to the *first* book, where the subject of their punishment is brought so fully to view. 'The fountains of heaven are opened, and these join with the abysses beneath in overwhelming the earth. God repents of the destruction of the world, and swears that he will no more repeat it. He places his "token in the heavens" as a sign or confirmation of this. The transgressors are reserved for the judgment of the great day, when the Elect One [the Messiah] shall judge them all.'

Chap. liv. 9—lv. 1 . . . 6, appear to be a fragment belonging to some historical prophecy respecting the doom of the Jews. 'The Parthians and Medes invade "the land of the elect;" they are repulsed; civil wars among the Jews succeed; and finally a great army, with chariots and men, come from the different quarters, so that the earth shakes to its foundation.' [Is not this the invasion by the Roman army under Vespasian and Titus?]

PARABLE THE THIRD. This commences with chap. lvi. 'Peace shall be to the saints, and God will be their everlasting light.' In those days Enoch is led 'to behold the secrets of the lightning and thunder, both when they are for a blessing and for a curse.' Chap. lvi. lvii.

'In the 500th year of Enoch's life the heavens and the earth shook violently; the Ancient of days was seen on his throne of glory, surrounded by myriads of angels; the time of judgment and punishment, as well as of reward, comes; to the righteous Leviathan and Behemoth will be given for a feast, [the usual Rabbinical fable in respect to these monsters, see Buxtorf Lex. Chald. on the words,] but the wicked will be severely punished.' Chap. lviii.

In chap. lix. the subject of "the secret agencies of nature" is again presented; e. g. of the winds, moon, lightning, ebb and flow of the sea, mist, rain, darkness, light, etc. Chap. lx—lxii. contain another brief, but important, development of the author's Christology; and, according to my plan, I pass them by for the present.

Another interpolation now occurs. Chap. lxiv—lxvii. contain what might be called a vision of *Noah*, rather than of Enoch. 'Noah hears a great earthquake, and goes to Enoch to inquire respecting it. Enoch tells him that the earth is about to be destroyed, because of the wickedness which exists upon it. Noah receives assurance that he shall be preserved, and that righteous and holy men shall spring from him. The angels about to punish the earth are then shown to him. The word of God afterward comes to him, with comforting assurances. The burning valley where the apostate angels are confined is then shewn him, where are rivers of fire and sulphur. There are waters in this valley, which are "healing to soul and body;" but when judgment comes upon the ungodly, who have revelled and denied the Lord of spirits, those waters shall be changed, and then become frozen.' [There is something remarkably obscure here, in the writer's description of these waters, which in one place he represents as "healing the soul and body," in another as "being for the healing and death of the bodies" of kings and princes; in one place as hot, and in another as frozen. I do not comprehend his meaning.] 'In chap. lxvii. the good angels are represented as melting into compassion, while they behold the severity of torments inflicted on the apostate ones. The irreversible sentence against the latter is re-affirmed.'

In chap. lxviii. the names of the leading apostate angels are again given, to the number of 21. Many of these are entirely different from the 18 names of the same leaders as given in chap. vii. 9. Next follow the names of other and different angels, employed in seducing men; while the particular things in which each of these apostate spirits was engaged, are specified, as in chap. viii., but much more copiously. But here again every name differs from the corresponding cases in chap. viii. One can scarcely avoid the conclusion, that chap. lviii. is a composition from another hand, and also that it is interpolated in the place where it now stands.

The last part of chap. lxviii. viz. verses 19—42, is perhaps an appendage to chap. lxvii., and contains an account of the secret name and oath of the Almighty by which all the concerns of the universe are managed and kept stable. It closes the third parable of the book of Enoch, and has its basis in some mystic theology of the writer's time, of which I have no certain knowledge. The two following chapters do not professedly belong to the third parable, and yet the matter of them is of the same general tenor with that which is found in the parables. The substance of them is, 'the rapture of Enoch into the heavens,' where he sees the mysteries of nature, and the heavenly hosts praising and blessing God, who is seated on a throne of ineffable glory. Enoch is accepted in his worship and piety, and promises of good are made to him and to the righteous.

We now come to a new species of composition, which is entitled: "*The book of the revolutions of the luminaries of heaven.*" It occupies chap. lxxi—lxxxi., and comprises the author's system of astronomy or astrology. It is in vain for any one to derive much from it which is intelligible, unless he is deeply conversant with the history of ancient oriental astronomy. The names given to the sun (Aryares and Tomas), and to the moon (Asonya, Ebla, Benase, Erae), are probably symbolical. The manner in which the writer undertakes to account for the motions and phases of the sun, moon, and heavenly bodies, shews him to have been a very attentive observer of matters of fact, and yet entirely ignorant of any true philosophical principles of astronomy. Such a man as Ideler, at Berlin, might probably make some curious disclosures by an attentive examination of this part of the book of Enoch. For readers at large, the *Book of the Luminaries* is at present a sealed book, with the exception of a few obvious particulars that any well informed man may comprehend.

The remainder of the work is occupied by other visions of Enoch, which are communicated to his son Mathusala. 'He was admonished, in a vision, of the coming flood; and his father, Mahalaleel, enjoins it upon him to intercede for the earth. He makes intercession; and his prayer is accepted only for a small remnant of men.' Chap. lxxxii. lxxxiii.

Another vision of Enoch, in a dream, is of a very singular cast, and follows the preceding one. Under the symbols of *black and white cows and bulls* is presented a kind of generic history of Adam's posterity; of the apostate angels as intermingling with them; of the punishment of the antediluvians; of Noah's ark, the flood, etc. Then the history of Moses, Saul, David, Solomon, etc. is continued under the symbol of *sheep*. This is carried on, although in a very obscure and sometimes even repulsive manner, down to a period near the Christian era, or perhaps after it. One can hardly recognize the author of the preceding parts of the book, in this insipid and almost monstrous production. Yet now and then a passage occurs, which renders it not improbable that the same hand did execute this portion of the work, which was employed in the preceding part. At present, we have not sufficient ground for disjoining them. This *unique* composition is comprised in chapters lxxxiv—lxxxix. It affords some *data*, as we shall hereafter see, for ascertaining the time when the book was written; data which are therefore highly important.

The two following chapters contain a hortatory address of Enoch to all his descendants, in which he gives them warnings, and enjoins upon them many moral precepts. They constitute a somewhat near resemblance to some of the prophetic homilies of the Old Testament.

Chapters xcii—civ. consist of similar materials, with some variation in manner. Here the periods of the world are divided into ten; and of these the first seems to comprise the time from the beginning down nearly to the deluge; the second nearly to Abraham; the third down to Moses; the fourth to the settlement in Canaan; the fifth to the completion of Solomon's temple; the sixth to the Babylonish exile; the seventh is marked by the existence of a perverse and corrupt generation, while the righteous are rewarded and much instruction is afforded them; [is not this characteristic of the apostasies before and during the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, and of the increased zeal on the part of those who were truly pious?] During the eighth period "sinners are delivered up into the hands of the righteous," [the forces of Antiochus Epiphanes are overcome by Judas Maccabæus], and "the house of the great King is built up for ever," [the temple is restored to its worship and repaired

by Judas]. In the *ninth* week, "the judgment of righteousness is revealed to the *whole* world...and all men are looking out for the path of integrity," [the gospel is preached to every creature?] In the last part of the *tenth* week comes the general judgment and final consummation of all things. Then are formed a new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness; comp. Rev. xx. xxi.

What follows in these chapters is hortatory, comminatory, and full of promise and consolation to the righteous who are oppressed. Denunciations of the wicked, particularly of persecutors and oppressors, are often repeated. 'In the hands of the most high are the elements, and all things; who can resist him? Who will dare to murmur against him? God will be terrible to the wicked; the righteous, after all their persecutions and sufferings, shall enjoy eternal peace. Of this they are assured by a most solemn oath. The sufferings of the righteous are described, and they are earnestly exhorted to persevere in their integrity; [comp. the frequent repetition of such a theme in the Apocalypse]. To them shall "books be given--books of joy and great wisdom [the New Testament?], in which they shall *believe* and *rejoice*." In those days Enoch's posterity shall instruct men; and God and *his Son* will forever hold communion with them.'

In the last chapter of the work, (cv.), 'Enoch again adverts to the antediluvian period, relates the extraordinary appearance of Noah at his birth, tells how he [Enoch], predicted the flood in connection with this, and that Noah was destined to survive it.'

'Yet another book, (we are told at the close of the whole work), was written by Enoch, *respecting the righteous in the latter days*, [Messianic period]. The ungodly and persecutors will be consumed in a vast and dreadful fire; but "those who have suffered in their bodies" and been "injuriously treated by wicked men" . . . . will be "brought into splendid light . . . and placed, each of them, on a throne of glory . . . during unnumbered periods."

The whole closes with the following subscription: "*Here ends the vision of Enoch the prophet. May the benediction of his prayer, and the gift of his appointed period, be with his beloved! Amen.*"

Such is a summary of the contents of this singular, but in many respects deeply interesting relic of antiquity. The reader who has never pursued at much length the study of sacred criticism, cannot well imagine how much light is cast by it on various parts of the New Testament; particularly on the Apocalypse, the general object and tenor of which bear no small resemblance to the book of Enoch. In both works, the consolation of the righteous who are persecuted; the denunciation of the wicked, and of persecutors in particular; and finally, the prediction of a glorious period when all shall be light and peace—are objects which are constantly in view. That they were written nearly at the same period, and were suggested or occasioned by similarity of circumstances, has been fully impressed on my mind by the attentive study of both productions. And yet —how *different* are the two compositions, although partial and even general resemblances are so frequent! In grandeur of conception, appropriate use of imagery, richness of fancy, splendour of description, and above all in unity, concinnity, moral sublimity, freedom from childish conceit and ignorance and superstition and wild imagination, the Apocalypse stands far removed from and high above the Book of Enoch; I had almost said as far, as the *real* author of the former composition is elevated above the writer of the latter.

Ewald, in his recent, and in many respects very able work on the Apocalypse, (p. 9. et al.) assumes the position, that the writer drew from the book of Enoch, many things inserted in his work. My convictions are very different. I find nothing in either book which obliges me to believe that the one author drew from the other. Two Jews, writing at the same period, having the same general theme and object in view, both deeply versed in and familiar with the Old Testament Scriptures, both speaking the same language and conversant with the like circle of thought and imagery, can scarcely be supposed not to present frequent points of resemblance. Both authors, in the present case, range the world of imagination, and deal altogether in visions and symbols; both employ the like machinery (if I may so speak) of angels and angel-interpreters; both express high and adoring views of God and his Son; both dwell with rapture on the future joys of the faithful, and

with sacred awe or even horror on the future sufferings of the wicked. Why should there not be found many points of resemblance—much as to both matter and manner in the one, which will resemble and illustrate the matter and manner of the other?

I have in these remarks assumed the fact, that the book of Enoch was composed about the same time as the Apocalypse, i. e. in the latter half of the first century. The proof of this will be presented in its place; but, for the present, I must proceed in the accomplishment of my design, which is, to give the reader such an account of the book before us as will reasonably satisfy his curiosity, although he may not be able to procure an inspection of the work itself.

I have already given a summary of the contents of the book. But by doing this merely, the manner of the work is not set before the reader so as to give him a *specific* view of it. In order to accomplish this last object, I must of necessity make a few extracts from the work, that he may judge for himself of its tenor.

I will begin by some specimens from the closing part of the book; for these will best exhibit the manner of the writer, in his exhortations, threatenings, and promises.

After he has finished his description of the *ten* periods (see p. 103. above) into which the time of the world is divided, he thus proceeds: (Chap. XCII. 16 seq.)

"A spacious eternal heaven shall spring forth in the midst of angels. The former heaven shall depart and pass away; a new heaven shall appear; and all the celestial powers shine with sevenfold splendour for ever. Afterwards, likewise, there shall be many weeks [long periods like those before named], which shall eternally exist in goodness and in righteousness. Neither shall sin be named there for ever and ever. Who is there of all the children of men, capable of hearing the voice of the Holy One without emotion? Who is there capable of thinking his thoughts? Who, capable of contemplating all the workmanship of heaven? Who, of comprehending the deeds of heaven? He may behold its animation, but not its spirit. He may be capable of conversing respecting it, but not of ascending to it. He may see all the boundaries of these things, and meditate upon them; but he can make nothing like them. Who of all men is able to understand the breadth and length of the earth? By whom have the dimensions of all these things been seen? Is it every man who is capable of comprehending the extent of heaven, what its elevation is, and by what it is supported? How many are the numbers of the stars? And where do all the luminaries remain at rest?"

The latter part of the Apocalypse; or more probably Is. lxv. 17 seq., and a part of the book of Job, seem to have been the writer's prototypes in composing this paragraph. The execution of his task is certainly not unworthy of approbation.

Let us now see, how he can tread in the steps of the author of Proverbs, and of some homiletic parts of the Hebrew prophets.

CHAP. XCIII. 3 seq. "Let me exhort you who are righteous, not to walk in the paths of evil and oppression, nor in the paths of death. Choose for yourselves righteousness and a good life. Walk in the paths of peace, that you may live, and be found worthy. Retain my words in your inmost thoughts, and blot them not from your hearts; for I know that sinners counsel men to commit crime craftily."

Again in Chap. XCV. 1 seq. "Wait in hope, ye righteous; for suddenly shall sinners perish from before you, and you shall exercise dominion over them according to your will. In the day of the suffering of sinners your offspring shall be exalted, and lifted up like the eagles. Your nest shall be more exalted than that of the *West*; you shall go up, and enter into the cavities of the earth, and into the clefts of the rocks for ever, like hares, from the sight of the ungodly, who shall groan over you, and weep like sinners. You shall not fear those who trouble you; a splendid light shall shine around you, and the voice of tranquility shall be heard from heaven."

Once more, CHAP. CII. 6 seq, "Fear not, ye souls of the righteous, but wait with patient hope the day of your death in righteousness. Grieve not because your souls descend in great trouble, with groaning, lamentation, and sorrow, to the receptacle of the dead. In your lifetime, your bodies have not received a recompense in proportion to your goodness, but in the period of your existence have sinners existed; in the period of execration and punishment. And when you die, sinners say concerning you: As we die, the righteous die. What profit have they of their works? Behold, like us, they expire in sorrow and in darkness. What advantage have they over us? Henceforward we are equal. . . . . I say unto you sinners . . . . have you not marked the righteous, how their end is peace? for no oppression is found in them, even to the day of their death. . . . . I swear to you, ye righteous, by the greatness of his [God's] splendour and glory, by his illustrious kingdom and majesty, to you I swear, that I comprehend this mystery; that I have read the tablet of heaven, have seen the writing of the Holy Ones, and have discovered what is written and impressed on it concerning you. I have seen that all goodness, joy, and glory, have been prepared for you, and been written down for the spirits of those who die eminently righteous and good. To you it shall be given in return for your troubles; and your portion of happiness shall far exceed the portion of the living. The spirits of those who die in righteousness, shall exist

and rejoice. Their spirits shall exult, and their remembrance shall be before the face of the Mighty One, from generation to generation. Nor shall they fear disgrace."

After another parænetic strain of the like tenor, in chap. CIV., the writer adds :

"To the righteous and the wise shall be given books of joy, of integrity, and of great wisdom. To them shall books be given, in which they shall believe and rejoice. All the righteous shall be rewarded, who, from these, shall acquire the knowledge of every upright path. . . . I and my Son will for ever hold communion with them in the paths of uprightness, while they are still alive. Peace shall be yours. Rejoice, ye children of integrity, in the truth."

Such is the strain of exhortation and promise to the righteous. The denunciations of the wicked are more protracted, and often repeated in various ways and forms. I must content myself with a few specimens.

CHAP. XI. 7 seq. "When iniquity, sin, blasphemy, tyranny, and every evil work, shall increase; and when transgression, impiety, and uncleanness also shall increase ; then upon them [the wicked] shall all great punishment be inflicted from heaven. The holy Lord shall go forth in wrath and with punishment, that he may execute judgment upon the earth. In those days oppression shall be cut off from its roots, and iniquity with fraud shall be eradicated, perishing from under heaven. Every place of strength shall be surrendered with its inhabitants ; with fire shall it be burnt. They shall be brought from every part of the earth, and be cast into a judgment of fire. They shall perish in wrath, and by a judgment overpowering them for ever."

The reader will readily call to mind some of the gravest passages in the Hebrew prophets, when he reads the following :

Chap. XCIII. seq. "Wo to those who build up iniquity and oppression, and who lay the foundation of fraud ; for suddenly shall they be subverted, and never obtain peace. Wo to those who build up their houses with crime ; for from their very foundations shall their houses be demolished, and by the sword shall they themselves fall. Those who acquire gold and silver, shall justly and suddenly perish. Wo to you who are rich, for in your riches have you trusted ; but from your riches shall you be removed, because you have not remembered the Most High in the days of your prosperity. You have committed iniquity and blasphemy, and are destined to the day of the effusion of blood, to the day of darkness, and to the day of the great judgment. This I declare and point out to you, that he who created you will destroy you. When you shall fall, your Creator will not shew mercy to you, but rejoice in your destruction."

The following strain seems almost an echo of Jeremiah's voice:

Chap. XCIV. 1 seq. "O that my eyes were clouds of water, that I might weep over you, and pour forth my tears like rain, and rest from the sorrow of my heart! Who has permitted you to hate and to transgress? Judgment shall overtake you, ye sinners. . . . Wo to you who shall be so bound by execrations, that you cannot be released from them; the remedy being removed from you on account of your sins. Wo to you who recompense your neighbour evil; for you shall be recompensed according to your works. Wo to you, ye false witnesses, you who aggravate iniquity; for you shall suddenly perish. Wo to you sinners, for you reject the righteous; for you receive or reject at pleasure those who commit iniquity; and their yoke shall prevail over you."

Again in chap. XCVI. 19 seq. "Ye are destined to the day of the great judgment, to the day of distress, and the extreme ignominy of your souls. Wo to you, ye obdurate in heart, who commit crime and feed on blood. Whence is it that you feed on good things, drink, and are satiated? Is it not because our Lord, the Most High, has abundantly supplied every good thing upon the earth? To you there shall be no peace. Wo to you who love the deeds of iniquity. Why do you hope for that which is good? Know that you shall be given up into the hands of the righteous, who shall cut off your necks, slay you, and shew you no compassion. Wo to you who rejoice in the trouble of the righteous, for a grave shall not be dug for you. Wo to you who frustrate the word of the righteous, for to you there shall be no hope of life. Wo to you who write down the word of falsehood, that they may hear and not forget folly. To them there shall be no peace, but they shall surely die suddenly."

One specimen more is all that can be allowed. After several paragraphs similar to what has been already quoted, the final judgment is thus introduced.

Chap. XCIX. 1 seq. "In those days the angels shall descend into the places of concealment, and gather together in one spot all who have assisted in crime. In that day shall the Most High rise up to execute the great judgment upon all sinners, and to commit the guardianship of all the righteous and holy to the holy angels, that they may protect them as the apple of an eye, until every evil and every crime be annihilated. Whether or not the righteous sleep securely, wise men shall then truly perceive. And the sons of the earth shall understand every word of that book, knowing that their riches cannot save them in the ruin of their crimes. Wo to you, ye sinners, when ye shall be afflicted on account of the righteous in the day of great trouble; shall be burned in the fire; and be recompensed according to your deeds. Wo to you, ye perverted in heart, who are watchful to obtain an accurate knowledge of evil, and to discover terrors. No one shall assist you. Wo to you sinners; for with the words of your mouths, and with the work of your hands, have you acted impiously; in the flame of blazing fire shall you be burned."

Such is the strain of promise, exhortation, and threatening, in the closing part of the book before us. Passages like to these are scattered through the whole work; but no where are they so long or so uniform and uninterrupted as here:

I must of necessity be very brief, after extracts so copious as those already presented, in the exhibition of other parts of the book. The superstition of the writer in matters of *angelology* and *demonology* may be shewn in a short extract.

After representing a combination of 200 angels to cohabit with the fair daughters of men, and naming 18 of their leaders, the writer thus proceeds:

Chap. VII. 10 seq. "Then they took wives, each choosing for himself; whom they began to approach, and with whom they cohabited; teaching them sorcery, incantations, and the dividing of roots and trees, [i. e. the selecting of such medicaments as were adapted to purposes of sorcery.] And the women conceiving brought forth giants, whose stature was each three hundred cubits. These devoured all which the labour of men produced; until it became impossible to feed them; then they turned themselves against men in order to devour them; and began to injure birds, beasts, reptiles and fishes, to eat their flesh one after another, and to drink their blood. Then the earth reproved the unrighteous."

Next he represents the evil and apostate angels as teaching all kinds of the curious mechanic arts; also as teaching sorcerers, the dividers of roots, the solution of sorcery, the observers of stars, signs, astronomy, the motion of the moon, etc. [i. e. all kinds of peculiar human knowledge proceeded from the apostate angels.] Chap. viii.

In chap. xv. he represents the progeny of the giants as being *demons* or *evil spirits*, who are therefore utterly excluded from heaven.

In chap. xxii. Enoch is represented as being carried by the angel who accompanied him to "another spot," i. e. a different one from the prison of the sinning angels, which he had just seen. Then he thus proceeds:

"I saw on the west a great and lofty mountain, a strong rock, and four delightful places. Internally it was deep, capacious, and very smooth; as smooth as if it had been rolled over; it was both deep and dark to behold [i. e. difficult to be seen]. Then Raphael, one of the holy angels who were with me, answered and said: These are the delightful places where the spirits, the souls of the dead, will be col-

lected. For them were they formed, and here will be collected all the souls of the sons of men. These places in which they dwell shall they occupy until the day of judgment, and until their appointed period. Their appointed period will be long, even until the great judgment. And I saw the spirits of the sons of men who were dead; and their voices reached to heaven while they were accusing. [Comp. Gen. 4: 10. Rev. 6: 9, 10] .... I inquired ... respecting the general judgment, saying Why is one separated from another? He answered: Three separations have been made between the spirits of the dead, and thus have the spirits of the righteous been separated, namely, by a chasm, by water, and by light above it. And in the same way, likewise, are sinners separated when they die, and are buried in the earth, judgment not overtaking them in their lifetime. Here their souls are separated. Moreover, abundant is their suffering until the time of the great judgment, the castigation, and the torment of those who eternally execrate [God and the saints], whose souls are punished and bound there for ever and ever. And thus has it been from the beginning of the world. Thus has there existed a separation between the souls of those who utter complaints [the righteous], and of those who watch for their destruction, to slaughter them in the day of sinners. [Comp. Luke 22: 53]. A receptacle of this sort has been formed for the souls of unrighteous men and of sinners; of those who have completed crime, and associated with the impious whom they resemble. Their souls shall not be annihilated in the day of judgment, neither shall they arise from this place.—Then I blessed God."

These passages give us deeply interesting views of current opinion among the Jews of the first century, or at least among the Christian Jews of that period. The critical and doctrinal use which can be made of them, will suggest itself to every one who is accustomed to reflect on subjects of this nature.

I must be indulged in a brief specimen of the author's conceptions, respecting the origin and causes of several phenomena in the natural world.

Chap. XXXIII. XXXIV. "Thence I advanced toward the *north*, to the extremities of the earth, [comp. the Hebrew אַפְסֵי הָאָרֶץ, N. Test. τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς], and there I saw a great and glorious wonder, at the extremities of the whole earth. I saw there the heavenly gates, opening into heaven; three of them distinctly separated. The northern winds proceeded from them, blowing cold, hail, frost, snow, dew, and rain. From one of the gates they blew mildly; but when they blew from the two other gates, it was with violence and force. They blew over the earth strongly .... I saw three gates open to the *south*, from which issued dew, rain, and wind. Thence I went to the extremities of the heaven eastward; where I saw three heavenly gates open to the east, which had smaller gates within them. Through each of these small gates the stars of heaven passed on, and proceeded to-

wards the west by a path which was seen by them, and that at every period of their appearance."

One specimen from the "Book of the Revolutions of the Luminaries of Heaven." Six gates Enoch sees in the east, and six in the west, through which the sun, moon, and stars, rise and set. He then proceeds to give an account of the *sun:*

Chap. LXXI. 6. seq. "First proceeds forth that great luminary, which is called the *Sun*; the orb of which is as the orb of heaven, the whole of it being replete with splendid and flaming fire. As to its chariot, where it ascends the wind blows. The sun sets in heaven, and returning by the north, [the reader will mark this conception], to proceed towards the east, is conducted so as to enter by that gate, and illuminate the face of heaven. In the same manner it goes forth in the first month by a great gate. It goes forth through the fourth of those six gates, which are at the rising of the sun. And in the fourth gate, through which the sun with the moon proceeds, in the first part of it. There are twelve open windows, from which issues out a flame, when they are opened at their proper periods. When the sun rises in heaven it goes forth through this fourth gate thirty days, and by the fourth gate in the west of heaven, on a level with it descends. During that period, the day is lengthened from the day, and the night curtailed from the night, thirty days. And then the day is longer by two parts than the night. . . . The sun now returns to the east, entering into the sixth gate, and rising and setting in the sixth gate 31 days, on account of its signs. At that period the day is longer than the night, *being twice as long as the night* . . . becoming twelve parts, and the night six parts."

The reflecting reader will see at once, by the tenor of this last passage, that the author must have lived in, or been acquainted with, regions of latitude much higher than Palestine; for what he says can apply only to the regions between 45 and 49 degrees of latitude. An oriental Jew, living high up in ancient Media, where many of the ten tribes were carried in their exile, (2 K. 17: 6), might easily become acquainted with this relative length of the day and night in the Caucasian regions above him, i. e. on the north of the Euxine and Caspian Seas. But it is not easy to suppose, that facts of this nature were familiarly known in Palestine. The Scriptures never advert to them.

Thus have I endeavored to make my readers in some measure acquainted with the nature and manner of the work before me. It is time now to turn our attention to other objects.

The *Christology* of the Book of Enoch is one of the most prominent and interesting features of the work. Of course it must be so to all, who wish to know, from other sources than the Bible, what were the early opinions of the Jews and Christians respecting the *Messiah*. We have been often told, and by authors of distinguished reputation in the learned world, that the common views of Christians respecting the exalted character and nature of the Messiah, are all the result of speculation subsequent, by many scores of years, to the rise of Christianity and to the composition of the New Testament. It has been averred often and loudly, that the Jews of our Saviour's time never had the least expectation of an "incarnate God," as their Messiah, and that the scoffing and infidelity of the Jews, at a later period, arose from the circumstance that Christians set up extravagant claims in behalf of their supposed Redeemer. Many books and treatises have been written to establish these positions; and the proof to which resort has been had, in most or all of them, has been, what is said in the Talmud and in the Rabbinical writings, (long subsequent to the origin of Christianity), in regard to this subject.

What I at present propose is quite a different sort of appeal, and one of much higher authority. How could the Rabbins of the Talmud and other Jewish productions, brought up to utter maledictions against the Saviour, do less than give degrading views of him in opposition to the high claims of Christians, claims even to a nature truly divine? Is it reasonable to expect any thing less, than that the rancorous disputants among them would disclaim the idea that a Messianic glory is predicted in the Old Testament, of such a nature and character as that in which Christians believed, and which they endeavored to establish and defend?

We have before us, however, a book of an *earlier* date than the usual works of the Rabbins. On the supposition that the apostle Jude has quoted it, (which is, and has been, the general opinion of critics), then the Book of Enoch is older than some parts of the New Testament, to say the least. How MUCH OLDER—is a question, on which something must now be said, in order to prepare the way for an account of its CHRISTOLOGY. It is the more necessary to discuss this subject, because I am dissatisfied with Dr. Laurence's conclusion respecting the age of the book before us.

In his Preliminary Dissertation (p. xxiii. seq.) he has discussed this question in a very ingenious and able manner; as he is wont to do most questions which he undertakes to discuss. His *general* argument to show the *terminos intra quos* it must have been written, is plain to every attentive reader of the book, and has a fair claim to be deemed conclusive. It is briefly this: As Jude, in his epistle, quotes from the book, so it must have been written *previous* to that period, (which was probably in the last quarter of the first century.) And inasmuch as the writer has every where borrowed not only words and phrases from the book of Daniel, but made this book a kind of model, and copied after its tenor, as well as adopted its imagery and machinery; so the Book of Enoch must have been written *subsequent* to the Book of Daniel.

This is plain and satisfactory; and it is abundantly confirmed, as we shall soon see, by the contents of the book itself.

In chap. lxxxiv—lxxxix. is an *allegorical* narrative of the leading events belonging to the history of the Jews. This history is carried on to the number of *seventy* kings or princes who had dominion over them. These are divided into three different classes; viz. (1) Thirty-five. (2) Twenty-three. (3) Twelve. The first class are evidently the kings of Judah and Israel, mentioned in sacred writ, viz. 20 of Judah, and 17 of Israel. Dr. Laurence supposes, that we must read *thirty-five* instead of thirty-seven; and makes out his catalogue accordingly, omitting some few kings whose reign was too short to deserve notice, such as Jehoahaz, Zimri, Tibni, Zechariah (son of Jeroboam), and Shallum. But I take *seventy* here, as Lücke and Hoffmann do, to be merely a round *symbolical* number, and therefore do not feel the need of such a minute correction of the text in the Book of Enoch.

It is unnecessary to specify by name the thirty-seven kings of Israel and Judah, inasmuch as they are all recorded in the Scriptures. But the second class of *Shepherds*, (as the Book of Enoch names them,) evidently comprehend the *foreign* kings who had dominion over the Jews. Of these *twenty-three* are reckoned; viz. *four* Babylonian monarchs, Nebuchadnezzar, Evilmerodach, Neriglissar, and Belshazzar; *eleven* Persian, Darius the Mede, Cyrus, Cambyses, Darius

Hystaspes, Xerxes, Artaxerxes Longimanus, Darius Nothus, Artaxerxes Mnemon, Ochus, Arogus or Arses, and Darius; *eight* of Macedonian or Grecian origin, Alexander, Ptolemy Soter, Ptolemy Philadelphus, Ptolemy Euergetes, Ptolemy Philopator, Antiochus the Great, Seleucus Philopator, and Antiochus Epiphanes. From the hands of the last named king, the government of Judea was wrested by Judas Maccabæus and his associates.

The third and last class consists of twelve only, which comprehends the closing list of princes belonging to the Jewish nation. These Dr Laurence reckons, by commencing with Mattathias, the father of Judas Maccabæus, and then reckoning after him Judas Maccabæus, Jonathan, Simon, John Hyrcanus, Aristobulus I., Alexander Jannæus, Alexandra his widow, Aristobulus II., Hyrcanus, Antigonus, and Herod. Thus he supposes, as it was natural to do with these views, the author of the book before us to have lived in the reign of Herod, which extended to 34 years, because the catalogue of kings ends with him. A fair conclusion, no doubt, at least one altogether probable, provided Dr. L. begins his last reckoning at the proper place.

But I have doubts of this; first, from the history of the Hasmonæan or Maccabæan family; and secondly, from other passages in the book of Enoch, which seem to indicate a *later* origin of the work than the time of Herod; as we shall see in the sequel.

Confining myself to the first point for the present, I remark, that the Jewish history does not shew that any of the Hasmonæan family were properly kings, until Simon (143 B. C.) obtained from the Syrian King, Demetrius, a royal edict declaring the Jews to be a free and independent people, and relinquishing all claims for tribute, custom, and taxes. This had not been done before. Soon after this, by a general assembly of the Jews at Jerusalem the office of High Priest and Regent was confirmed to Simon, and made *hereditary* in his family. Beginning here, then, as the most natural place of reckoning, (for the previous leaders of the Jews, had been such only by virtue of the exigences of revolution, and not by any formal choice,) we must go on, in order to make out twelve, and include Archelaus (A. D. 2), and Agrippa (A. D. 38.) Besides these two, we must, as justice properly requires, reckon in Alexander, who came

after Aristobulus II.; for he not only contended many years to obtain the sovereignty of Judea, but he had the whole country, at two different times, in his power and under his sway. The number 12 is thus made out, by this mode of reckoning; and as to Agrippa, he was the last Jewish king, who had possession of the country of Palestine.

Dr. Laurence objects, that if we go beyond the reign of Herod, we must make out 15 princes instead of 12, even if we begin to reckon with Judas Maccabæus. But to make out this, he includes all three of Herod's Sons, viz. Archelaus, Philip, and Herod Antipas; whereas the two latter had no dominion over *Judea*. It seems to me, therefore, not only that his mode of reckoning is unnecessary, but that it is far from being the most probable. Still, which ever method of reckoning is adopted, it brings the composition of the book of Enoch within quite restricted limits. It must have been written *subsequent* to the commencement of Herod's reign, and *before* the epistle of Jude was written.

There is one thing said in the book of Enoch (chap. 89: 25), respecting the last twelve shepherds, i. e. kings, which has not a little perplexed the commentators on this production, viz. that "the last twelve . . . *destroyed more* than those who preceded them," that is, more than the other 58 kings. How can this be said, with any probability of the Hasmonæan race of kings, or even of some of their successors?

Of Mattathias, Judas Maccabæus, and Jonathan his brother and successor, all of them successful vindicators of Jewish liberty, this is obviously untrue; and therefore Dr. L.'s mode of reckoning which includes these leaders, becomes the more improbable. But, commencing with Alexander Jannæus (B. C. 104), we find almost every sovereign, from that time downward, involved in bitter and bloody domestic wars, either against rivals or against factions in the state. I can scarcely doubt, that the writer of the book of Enoch had Herod most of all in his eye, when he penned the above general characteristic of the last dynasty of kings. The Jews as a body had a strong hatred of this tyrannical and bloody prince.

The writer, moreover, seems to have had a very low opinion of kings in general; for in chap. 89: 33, he represents the *whole* of the seventy shepherds or kings as brought

to judgment, and consigned to punishment. It is thus evident, that with him *a potiori nomen fit ;* he gives the general character of the whole from his view of the predominating characteristics among them. This will do better for a book of visions like his—a work which consists of a kind of symbolical poetry—than for plain and sober history.

Another circumstance in the book of Enoch serves to mark its chronology, in some measure. In chap. liv. 9, 10, the *Parthians* are introduced as invading Judea, and overrunning it : "The chiefs of the East, among the Parthians and Medes, shall remove kings in whom a spirit of perturbation shall enter. They shall hurl them from their thrones, springing as lions from their dens, and like famished wolves in the midst of a flock. They shall go up and tread upon the land of their elect . . . The threshing-floor, the path, and the city of my righteous people shall impede the progress of their horses."

The Parthians, as such, were unknown in history until about 250 B. C. Their first king began his reign about 230 B. C. By degrees their power grew up, so as to become the most formidable rival power which the Roman empire ever had to contend with in ancient times. About 41 B. C. they overran Syria, in combating against the Romans. Thence, in the following year, they went to Palestine, where they drove out Herod, and placed Antigonus, the last of the Hasmonæan race of kings, upon the throne in his stead. Herod it was, in whom (as Enoch says) was "the spirit of perturbation," and who was put down by them. They were soon compelled to retreat, however, by the interposing aid of the Romans in behalf of Herod. And this seems to be what the writer means, in the last part of the quotation made above.

Here then we come down at least to 40 years B. C., as a period *before* which the book of Enoch could not be written. Later still we must place it, as I believe ; although Dr. Laurence and Hoffmann agree upon a period not long after 40 B. C.

In chap. lv., the seer represents himself as beholding "another army of chariots, with men riding in them . . . coming from the east, the west, and the south." The whole earth trembles with them, and "their noise is heard from the extremities of the earth to the extremities of heaven." Dr.

Laurence and Hoffmann refer this to the military interpositions, on the part of the Romans, in behalf of Herod, in order to restore him to the throne. But these seem to be too brief, and on too small a scale, to give rise to such glowing terms of description as are here employed. It will be remembered, that the Roman dominion existed on all sides of Palestine; hence the phraseology of the writer, which represents attacks as coming from different quarters. It is certainly a natural interpretation of this passage, which construes it as having respect to the invasion of Judea under Vespasian and Titus. And if this interpretation be well founded, then the composition of the book must have been subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans.

Another circumstance serves to confirm this interpretation. In chap. lxxxix. 29, the seventy shepherds and the blind sheep, i. e. the wicked kings and obdurate Jews, are represented as being brought to judgment, condemned and "thrust into an abyss of fire on the earth, and burnt." That abyss is said to be "on the right side of the house," i. e. on the south of the temple; and therefore the writer doubtless means *Gehenna* or *the valley of Hinnom*. The author then goes on to represent the ancient house [the temple] as being immerged [in fire], save its "pillars and ivory," [comp. Rev. xi. 1, 2], and then "the Lord of the sheep produces a new house, great and loftier than the former, which he bounded by the former circular spot." This cannot mean the second temple built after the return from the Babylonish exile; because what is described here all takes place *after* all the seventy kings have completed their reign. It must mean the new spiritual temple then to be built in the place of that which was destroyed by the Romans. So the context, too, would seem to persuade us. '*All worshippers from all parts of the earth*, are to come to this new temple, and *the Lord of the sheep rejoices over them all.*' Is not this an expression of the writer's views, in regard to the universal spread of the Christian religion? Of this we shall be better able to judge, when we have examined the nature of his Christology.

We have already seen (p. 103) that the author divides the duration of the world into *ten* periods, or *weeks*, as he calls them. The eighth period is that in which the Syrian kings are worst-

ed, and the house of God refitted and restored to its sacred rites. The *ninth* period is the one, during which "the judgment of righteousness shall be revealed to the whole world . . . and all men shall be on the look out for the path of integrity." Chap. xcii. 14, 15. What is this but the diffusion of gospel light among the Gentiles? For after all this, and in the tenth week, comes the general judgment, and a new heaven will then be created. It seems probable, then, that the writer lived and wrote during the ninth week which he has described, i. e. after the gospel was propagated to the Gentiles.

On grounds such as these, Prof. Lücke of Göttingen, inclines to the opinion, that the Book of Enoch was composed *after* the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem by the Romans, p. 60 seq. of his *Einleitung*. Dr. Nitzsch of Bonn, one of the most competent judges of apocryphal writings now living, has expressed the like opinion in his *De Test.* xii. *Patriarcharum*, p. 17 seq. On p. 31 of this volume he remarks, that the Book of Enoch, "both in respect to its *age* and the tenor of the work, is not much remote from the Testament of the twelve Patriarchs." This last work, he has shown, I believe to the satisfaction of all, to be a production of the latter part of the first century, or of the beginning of the second.

In repeated and careful perusals of the Book of Enoch, I have lighted upon and noted other passages besides those to which I have already adverted, that would seem to indicate an acquaintance of its author with some of the books of the New Testament. I will produce them, in order that the reader may judge for himself.

Chap. xxxviii: 2. "It would have been better for them, that they had never been born;" comp. Matt. xxvi. 24, Mark xiv. 21, where the same expression is to be found, as used by the Saviour.

Chap. xlvi: 3, 4, "The Son of Man . . . shall raise up kings and the mighty from their couches, and the powerful from their thrones. . . He shall hurl kings from their thrones and their dominions; the countenance of the mighty shall he cast down, filling them with confusion;" comp. Luke i: 51, 52, where Mary says almost the same things of the Son of Man.

Chap. 48 b: 3. "With him dwells . . . . . the spirit of those who *sleep* in righteousness;" comp. the New Testament

idiom, where *sleep* is so often used as the image of death, and *sleeping in Jesus*, designates dying in the Christian faith.

Chap. xxiv. Enoch sees a tree among the mountains of judgment, "goodly in aspect . . . its leaf, flower, and bark, never wither . . . the sight of its fruit is delightful . . . the fruit of it shall be for the elect [after the judgment] . . . the sweet odour shall enter into their bones, and they shall live a long life;" comp. Rev. xxii: 2, 14. ii: 7.

In chap. xl. Enoch is represented as seeing countless myriads before the throne of God; and, in particular, *four* archangels standing on the four sides of his throne, and severally and successively addressing themselves to him who sat upon it. In Rev. iv—vi. the *four* ζῶα are represented as occupying the same position; and are presented as rational and intelligent beings, and as *successively* speaking, in like manner as the archangels in the book of Enoch.

In chap. xlvii. the blood of the righteous is said to "ascend from the earth, before the Lord of spirits, that he would execute judgment, and that his patience [with persecutors] may not endure for ever;" comp. Rev. vi: 9 seq. xi: 16—18. But perhaps the passage in Gen. iv: 10, is the basis of this.

Chap. xlvii: 3. 'The book of the living is opened, in the presence of God;' comp. Rev. xx: 12.

Chap. xlviii: 9. 'They [the persecuting wicked] shall burn in the presence of the righteous, and sink [into the great abyss] in the presence of the holy;' comp. Rev. xiv. 10.

Chap. xlv: 4, 5. 'A new heavens and a new earth are to be made for the dwelling place of the righteous;' comp. Rev. xxi: 1.

Chap. l: 1. 'The earth shall deliver up [for judgment] from her womb, and Hades shall deliver up from hers, that which it hath received; and destruction (אֲבַדּוֹן) shall restore that which it owes;' comp. Rev. xx: 13.

Add to these, now, the passage in ciii: 10; "Another mystery I also point out. To the righteous and the wise shall he given books of joy, of integrity, and of great wisdom. To them shall books be given in which they shall believe, and in which they shall rejoice." What books of such a nature, in addition to the Old Testament Scriptures, did the Jews expect, about the time when the Saviour made his appearance? And even if they expected that something might

be added to their stock of Rabbinical lore, would they then speak of these in such a manner as is here described? I must confess this sounds, to my ear, like reference to New Testament scriptures.

But I must cast myself, for the most conclusive evidence of a knowledge, or some knowledge, of the Gospels, and some of the Epistles of the New Testament, on evidence to be deduced from the *Christology* of the author. My general remark on this is, that it is altogether too particular, definite, and like to that of the New Testament, to be found in the writing of an uninspired Jew, just before the advent of the Saviour. Nothing parallel to it, or homogeneous with it, can be found in the Targums, or any of the earlier Jewish writings which have come down to us; nor does any thing disclosed in the New Testament respecting the state of the Jews, as to their Messianic views, lead us to the conclusion that their popular Christology was, at that time, developed in such a way as it appears in the book of Enoch.

Christology of the Book of Enoch.

This brings me to the more immediate and leading object of the present article. I shall proceed, therefore, first of all, to present the CHRISTOLOGY of our author; and then make such reflections upon the subject, as the nature of the case may seem to require.

My first remark on the topic now before us is, that although the proper name of the Saviour, i. e. *Jesus*, is not employed by the writer of the book of Enoch, yet almost all the other names descriptive of him, which are given in the New Testament, will be found in this book. Let me briefly pass these in review, with some characteristic declarations which accompany them.

(1.) THE ELECT ONE, and MY ELECT ONE. Thus in 45: 3, 4, the Elect One, it is said, will sit on a throne of glory, and choose the conditions and habitations of the saints, and dwell in the midst of them. Chap. 40: 5, the second archangel is heard, by Enoch, blessing the Elect One; (the first had blessed the Lord of spirits). Chap. 48: 5, "The Elect and Concealed One existed in presence of the Lord of spirits, before the world was created, and for ever." So in 48: 2, 4, the Elect One is in presence of the Lord

of spirits, and his glory is for ever and ever, and his power from generation to generation." In 50: 3 and 5. 51: 5, 10. 54: 5. 60: 7, 10, 13, and 61: 1, the Elect One is spoken of in like manner as in the quotations already made; and the context leaves no doubt that the same exalted personage is meant, which is designated in other passages by *Son of Man*, and by *Messiah*.

Let the reader now compare ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκλεκτός, Luke 23: 35, as a designation of the Messiah; also 1 Pet. 2: 4, παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ἐκλεκτόν, applicable to the same personage.

(2) SON OF GOD. Thus in 204: 2, "I and *my Son* will for ever hold communion with them," i. e. with the righteous.

(3) SON OF WOMAN. So in 61: 9, "Trouble shall seize upon them [the wicked], when they shall behold this *Son of woman* sitting upon the throne of his glory." Who is not almost of necessity remitted to Gal. 4: 4, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, for the origin of this peculiar appellation?

(4) MESSIAH. "They have denied the Lord of spirits and his Messiah," 48: 11. "All these things . . . shall be for the dominion of the Messiah, that he may command and be powerful on earth," 51: 4.

(5) SON OF MAN. This is the usual, and by far the most frequent designation employed by the writer of the book before us. Thus in 46: 1, 2, 3. 48: 2. 61: 10, 13, 17. 62: 15. 68: 38, 39, 40, 41. 69: 1, this designation occurs, and various attributes are connected with it by the context, and of course various characteristics are developed. Further notice of these will be taken in the sequel.

Respecting this last designation it is proper to remark, that it is the more striking in such a work as this, because we do not find it to have been a current appellation among the Jews of the first century. The Saviour employs it more commonly respecting himself, than any other appellation; with undoubted reference, as it seems to me, to the *locus classicus* in Dan. vii: 13. As employed by him it appears in the Gospels some 80 or more times. But the disciples never introduce it in any one instance respecting him, with the exception of Stephen, in Acts 7: 56. It is therefore the more remarkable that we should find it so frequent in the Book of Enoch; for this is contrary, as it would seem, to the common *usus loquendi* of the Jews at that period. How can this be accounted for on any other probable ground,

than that the writer had some knowledge of the narratives in the Gospels, and thus of the appellation, *Son of Man*, there given so often to the Messsiah?

Such are the appellations given to the Messiah in the book before us; appellations so various, and so consonant with those found in the New Testament, that one can scarcely refrain from believing that some acquaintance with the Christian Scriptures must have been made by the author of the book of Enoch. At all events, no merely Jewish usage, which is known to us, would, at so early a period, have led the writer in the path that he has trodden.

Justice to the whole case demands of me, however, also to remark, that the writer of the book before us has *omitted* some appellations of the Saviour, which are the more common ones in the New Testament. Thus he does not employ the appellations, *Jesus*, *Lord*, *Lord Jesus*, and *Jesus Christ*. But the simple name, *Christ*, he employs, i. e. he uses *Messiah*, which means Christ. If now the question be asked: 'Why did not the author, if he was a Christian, and was acquainted with the books of the New Testament, conform in respect to these appellations, to the usual practice of the New Testament writers?' the answer would be substantially the same, as it would in case we should be asked respecting the books of the New Testament: 'Why do none of the New Testament writers ever employ the phrase *Son of Man*, except the Evangelists; and these, never but when repeating the words of Jesus? Why, in some of the books of the New Testament, do particular designations of the Messiah altogether predominate, while others are scarcely, if at all, employed?' The truth seems to be, in relation to a matter of this kind, that among so many appellations bestowed upon the Messiah, some were more common among particular writers, and more favorite ones with them, than others. The *ground* of choice, in many cases, for aught that we can see, must have been altogether *subjective*. At all events, there does not seem, in respect to the particular under consideration, any thing of much weight against the supposition, that the writer of the book of Enoch may have had some acquaintance with the early productions of Christians.

But leaving this subject, I proceed to observe, that a consideration of the *predicates* assigned to the Messiah will set

the Christology of the book before us in a fuller light, and enable us better to judge of the *time* when it was composed. To this, therefore, we will now come.

(1) *The Son of Man is the supreme and final judge of men and angels.*

In chapter L. 1 seq. is a remarkable passage to this purpose, which has already been repeated in part. The writer represents 'the earth as delivering up her dead; Hades also, and Destruction (אֲבַדּוֹן) as doing the same. The righteous and the holy are then selected from among them; the Elect One is now seated upon his throne, and every secret of intellectual wisdom proceeds from his mouth,' i. e. he passes the sentence which wisdom dictates, on all who are assembled before him. And to shew that he is qualified for such a work, the writer adds: "For the Lord of spirits has gifted and glorified him." Who does not spontaneously recall Rev. 20: 13, and Matt. 25: 32?

Again, chap. liv. 5. "O ye kings, O ye mighty, who inhabit the world, you shall behold my Elect One, sitting upon the throne of my glory. And he shall judge Azazeel [the leading evil angel] and all his hosts, in the name of the Lord of spirits."

Such is the *judicial* power of the Elect One over evil spirits. Chap. 60: 10, 11 shows that the same power is exercised over men: "Then the Lord of spirits seated upon his throne the Elect One; *who shall judge all the works of the holy*, in heaven above, and in a balance shall he weigh their actions. And when he shall lift up his countenance *to judge their secret ways*, in the word of the name of the Lord of spirits, etc." The context shews here, that the *holy in heaven* means the saints who possess a human nature and who dwell there.

In Chap. 61: 9, 'the Elect One—the Son of woman—is represented as seated upon the throne of glory; the word of his mouth destroys sinners and the ungodly, who shall perish at his presence; "before him the saints shall be judged in righteousness," while kings, princes, and potentates of the earth, tremble and are greatly troubled.'

Chap. 68: 38, 39, presents us with the same view, rendered somewhat specific: "They [all creatures] blessed, glorified, and exalted [him], because the name of the Son of Man was revealed to them. He sat upon the throne of his glory;

and the principal part of the judgment was assigned to him, the Son of Man." Sinners shall perish ; and their seducers be bound in chains for ever ; . . . . "for the Son of man has been seen, sitting upon the throne of his glory," i. e. on the throne of judgment and condemnation.

Other passages there are, where the same doctrine appears to be recognised by the writer. But these cited are the most plain and direct, and therefore the most satisfactory.

Where now, we may ask, did the writer obtain his views of this specific office assigned to the Son of Man? The Old Testament, with all its predictions respecting the Messiah, can hardly be said to present us with any *specific* view in regard to this particular of the Messiah's office. His *universal dominion* is indeed often presented to view there ; and this, according to the custom of ancient times, involves a *judicial* power. But the passages before us are of a different tenor from the Old Testament Scriptures, and different from those of early Jewish writings, so far as they are known to us. Do they not partake of the characteristics of the New Testament writings, in which the *judicial* power of the Saviour is a leading trait of his office ?

(2) *The Son of Man is invoked, and praised, and blessed, and worshipped, in the heavenly world.*

In 48: 1 seq. Enoch is represented as seeing a never failing fountain of righteousness, of which the righteous, elect, and holy, drink. "In that hour was the Son of man invoked before the Lord of spirits, and his name in presence of the Ancient of Days. *Before the sun and stars were created ; before the stars of heaven were formed ; his name was invoked in presence of the Lord of spirits* . . . All who dwell on earth shall fall down and *worship* before him, shall bless and *glorify* him, and sing praises to the name of the Lord of spirits."

Chap. 60: 12 seq. When the saints shall be judged by the Elect One, then "they shall all speak, with united voice, and bless, glorify, exalt, and praise [him], in the name of the Lord of spirits. He shall call to every power of the heavens [all the different orders of the angels], and to the power of God, [i. e. as I understand it, to the host of God] ; [to] the Cherubim, the Seraphim, and the Ophannim [different orders of angels], all the angels of power, and all the angels of the LORDS, viz : of the ELECT ONE, and of the

OTHER POWER, who was upon earth, over the water on that day, [viz: the day of the creation]. They shall raise their united voice; shall bless, praise, glorify, and exalt, with the spirit of faith, etc., . . . all shall say, with united voice: Blessed is He; and the name of the Lord of spirits shall be blessed for ever and ever."

Here then is not only the worship of the Son of Man most plainly set forth, but the doctrine of the *Trinity* seems to be distinctly recognized. For what else can that "*other Power*, who was upon earth, over the water in that day" mean, except the "Spirit of God which moved upon the face of the great Abyss," before the creation of particular and distinct objects? What else can mean the LORDS, which is explained by the names *Elect One and other Power*, and these are united by the object of worship with the LORD OF SPIRITS?

Another passage in 61: 10 still further confirms the position that the Son of Man is the object of worship. "Then," i. e. when the Son of Man shall sit upon his throne of judgment, "shall the kings, and princes, and all who possess the earth, glorify him who has dominion over all things, Him who was concealed; for from the beginning the Son of Man existed in secret, whom the Most High preserved in the presence of his power, and revealed to the elect. . . . All kings, princes, the exalted, and those who rule over the earth, shall fall down on their faces before him, and shall worship him; they shall fix their hopes on this Son of Man, shall pray to him, and petition him for mercy."

In what light the writer viewed the Messiah, so far as it concerns his being the object of universal worship, cannot well be made any plainer than it is by these passages. Kindred ones might also be cited; but I forbear. As to the epithet *Concealed One*, we need only to advert to the context in order to explain it. In this we shall see, that the writer regarded the Son of Man as having been with God before the creation of the world; yea as being eternal. And what can *Concealed* mean, except that, before the incarnation, Christ was not revealed to men? Compare Col. 3: 3, "Ye are dead, and your life is *hid*, with Christ, in God;" i. e. your life is hid, as Christ is, with God. A little different sense must be assigned to the word *hid* here; but the modes of expression are kindred.

(3) *The Elect One, or the Son of Man, existed from eternity, or before the world was.*

I have already recited the passages, in connection with others designed to illustrate one or other of the preceding heads. But it will be proper, for the sake of distinct impression, to repeat them here, inasmuch as they are brief.

Chap. 48: 3. "Before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars of heaven were formed, his name was invoked in presence of the Lord of spirits."—48: 5, "The Elect or Concealed One existed in his presence, [before the Lord of spirits], *before the world was created, and for ever.*" Comp. John 1: 1—3.

Chap. 48: 2, exhibits the eternity of the Son of Man and his praise, i. e. his eternity *a parte post*, as theologians express it: "The Elect One stands before the Lord of spirits; and his glory is for ever and ever; and his power from generation to generation."

It is difficult to refrain from the supposition, that the writer of such passages must have had some acquaintance with the Gospel and Apocalypse of John. If any one is disposed to reverse the matter, and to say, as Ewald does in respect to the Apocalypse, that 'John copied from the book of Enoch;' my reply would be, that John bears, upon the face of all his writings, the stamp of originality. I do not think that this can be said, with the same degree of probability, of the book of Enoch.

It is impossible for me, by any mere *extracts* that I can make, to place the reader in such a position, that he can take a full view of all the Christology of the book of Enoch, with all its bearings. A full view can be had only by perusing chap. xxxviii—lxviii. inclusively, which contain what the writer calls his *Parables*. So often is the Son of Man, or Messiah, introduced here, and in such a variety of ways, that nothing but an attentive examination of the whole can make an adequate impression on the mind of the reader. How a Christology so special, full, and all pervading as this, could come from any Jew of the primitive age, unless he was a Christian, is more than I am able to explain; it is more than I am able at present to believe.

The attentive reader will now perceive some ground for the difficulty that I have had, in acceding to the views of Dr. Laurence, with regard to the *time* when the book of

Enoch was written. Not only do many passages, already laid before the reader, apparently contain matter which seems evidently to allude to events during and after the destruction of Jerusalem, but the whole contour of the Messianic part of the book indicates more knowledge of Christology than any uninspired Jew can reasonably be supposed to have possessed, during the reign of Herod, or at any time before Christianity was published. I believe I am safe in declaring that nothing like to this can be produced from any other writing among the Jews of that period.

I find myself therefore constrained to believe, that some writer, *during the latter part of the first century*, composed the work before us. I say the *first* century, for all critics on this book are agreed, that it is entirely destitute of any indications of a later origin. Besides this, two undoubted productions of the first century, the epistle of Jude and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, have appealed to it, and one of them certainly, or (as is generally supposed) both of them, have actually quoted it. A *later* origin therefore than the period named, seems to be out of all reasonable question. An earlier period than the latter part of the first century, seems also to be very improbable. At least the reasons already given for this opinion, appear satisfactory to my own mind.

But granting that the book was composed at the period which I have named, or even before the Christian era, I shall be asked: 'Of what consequence or use is it to us? And what have we to do with a Christology, which, although in some respects elevated, even sublime, and entitled to attention, is accompanied with much superstition, with extravagant demonology, and profound ignorance of the great phenomena of the natural world, and of the heavens?'

In regard to this last particular I might say, that the scriptural writers themselves have no special pre-eminence here. With them, speaking as they do in the popular language of the day, the earth is every where an extended plain; the heavens a solid expanse or arch over our heads, through apertures in which the rain pours down that is kept in reservoirs there; the earth stands upon the great abyss of waters; Sheôl, or the region of the dead is a subterranean abode; the sun and moon are the *great* luminaries of the heavens; and these, with all the fixed stars, make

actual revolutions, every day, around the whole earth. Natural philosophy, astronomy, geology, chemistry, as *sciences*, and I may say, every science of such a nature, is entirely foreign to the Scriptures, inasmuch as they were written purely for *moral* and *religious* purposes, and not to give lessons in science. The difference between the scriptural writers and the author of the book of Enoch, consists not then in the fact that the former possessed superior *scientific* knowledge, but in the fact that they have no where introduced such idle and phantastic speculations about the natural phenomena of the heavens and the earth, as we find in the book of Enoch. What was it that kept them from the like speculations? Not simply the spirit of piety; for the writer of Enoch developes the most unequivocal and deep reverence for God and divine things. Others may account for the difference then as they judge best; but I am not able to satisfy my own mind in any way so well, as by attributing this difference, in the present case, to that Spirit who guided the writers of the New Testament, and kept them from all vain and phantastic speculations on subjects of which they were ignorant, and in regard to which inspiration itself was not designed to enlighten them. The *absence* of ignorant conjectures in curious matters, is, in such a case, no proof of superior discretion and wisdom in the writers.

I allow, very readily, that the author of Enoch has exhibited not a little of superstitious conceit in his demonology. The very basis of the first part of his book, viz. the alleged carnal intercourse of angels with the daughters of men, is an actual impossibility, not to say absurdity. Yet such a belief was wide spread in the early ages of Christianity, not only among the Jews, but also among Christians. Almost all the early fathers fully believed that Gen. 6: 1, 2, teaches such a doctrine. It was and is a general belief among all the Jewish Rabbies—all who have not thrown off something of their ancient superstition. How could the author of the book of Enoch escape the general contagion of his time? Nor did the fact that he was an oriental man, (if such be the case, and most probably it is), at all guard him against this absurd superstition. The region of Middle Asia has been from time immemorial, and still is, peopled, in the view of its inhabitants, with Genii good and evil, with Amshaspends and Izeds, with the subordinate agents of Ormusd and Ahri-

man, who have continual intercourse with man, for the purposes of good and evil. Did our author belong to that region? Then we may easily account for it, why he believed in such phantasies as those which I have just been naming.

What now should have kept writers of the New Testament, in the manifold exhibitions that they have made of the power of evil spirits, from adopting and exhibiting such conceits as those in the book of Enoch? Those who believe in the *inspiration* of the writers, can easily answer the questions; those who do not, are bound to assign some credible and probable reason of such a phenomenon.

No one now pretends that the book of Enoch is an *inspired* book. Time was, when individuals probably thought so. The author of the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, in the first century, seems plainly to have regarded and quoted it as a *holy* book. Not less than ten times has he quoted it, and in the same way as the Scriptures themselves; see Fabr. Cod. Pseudep. i. p. 161 seq. Justin Martyr had doubtless his eye upon it, when he appeals to the intercourse of evil angels with the daughters of men as a matter of fact; which he does in Apol. Min. p. 44. Irenæus (Lib. iv. c. 30) refers to the account of the same transaction as matter of fact, and probably takes it from the book of Enoch. Tertullian expressly contends for the *authority* of the book; De Hab. Muliebri, c. 2. But Origen and almost all later fathers reject its claims to a place in the canon: as well they might. It never had a place either in the Jewish canon, or in that of the Christian Church catholic. But the Ethiopians, always fond of apocryphal stories, have inserted it among their Scriptures. How long this has been the fact, it is yet unknown.

No claim to any *authority* on the part of the book will now be made by any intelligent man. It is on no ground of this nature, that the Christology above exhibited has any claim to stand. The eternity of Christ; his divine nature; his claims to divine worship; his universal, absolute, eternal dominion; are not established by any quotations that I have made; nor have I made quotations with the design of representing them as in the least degree *authoritative*. It is on another ground that they stand; and this may need a moment's explanation.

Dr. Priestly and many other writers have labored much

to shew, that the doctrine of the *Deity* of Christ, and of the Trinity, are doctrines of later ages, the result of speculative philosophy, of Platonism, or of the Theosophy of the East, and that these views are altogether foreign to the primitive ages of Christianity. Here then is a book, written at all events during the first century or earlier, in which the claims of the Messiah to eternal existence, to divine worship, and to universal and perpetual dominion, are fully recognized and declared. It matters but little, as to our present object, whether the author was a Jew or a Christian, when he wrote it; although the latter appears to me almost certain. At all events such views about the Messiah were entertained at the early period in question. There is no probability that the writer of this book has brought before us views in relation to this subject, altogether foreign to others of his day. It is not a particular *theory* on this subject, which he appears to be broaching and defending; as is evidently the case in regard to his chapter on the Motions of the heavenly Luminaries, and some other natural phenomena. His denunciations are aimed at the wicked, specially against persecutors; his promises and encouragements are laid before the righteous in order to cheer them on their way; but in respect to both, he introduces the Son of Man as dispensing them, merely as though it were a matter of course, and would be deemed so by his readers. I must conclude, therefore, that he was surrounded by readers, at any rate that he addressed readers, who, as he believed, would easily recognize the Messianic views which he inculcated, or rather which he as it were unconsciously introduced.

With such facts then before us, what becomes of the repeated declarations which have been made, and made with much assurance, that the doctrine of the eternity of the Saviour, and of his claims to divine worship, and to absolute and universal sovereignty, are all the figments of later ages, of the third or fourth century? As men of candour and discernment, are not those who make such declarations deeply concerned to review them? The evidence afforded by the book of Enoch, of the popular views cherished among the Jews, or at any rate the Jewish Christians of his day, is so strong, I might say conclusive, that I know not how a fair and ingenuous mind can resist it. And if it be acknowledged, then many a book is undone which has been written

on this deeply interesting subject; and many a rash and positive assertion is to be retracted.

I must relinquish the further pursuit of this topic for want of room. I would merely bespeak the patience of my readers, while I make a few miscellaneous remarks in regard to the production before us.

Beyond all question the author was of Hebrew origin. A deep and familiar acquaintance with the Hebrew Scriptures is manifest, through every part of his work; so manifest, that an attentive reader of it needs no proof of this assertion, for not a shadow of doubt can rest on his mind. Not only the Jewish Scriptures are familiar, but the country of the Jews, and specially Jerusalem and its vicinity are familiar objects of reference. There can be no question of his acquaintance with Jewish objects and Jewish history.

But, on the other hand, there are parts of his book which show a *foreign* literature. His astronomy is not Hebrew. It must be either Egyptian or Chaldean; most probably the latter. The images of *light, glory, splendour, radiance*, are so frequent and full in his work, as to argue an origin from, or at least a familiar acquaintance with, Middle Asia, the region of Zoroaster, and of his theosophy which was all encircled with light and splendour. Among the speculations of this theosophy is the idea, that garments, all splendid and shining are made for the righteous, by Izeds or female angels, and kept in heaven, to be worn there after a life of piety. In Enoch 62: 18, seems to be an expression which has its basis, perhaps, in this notion, which unconsciously had insinuated itself into the writer's mind: "The saints have been clothed with the garment of life [after their resurrection]; *thy garment of life is with the Lord of spirits.*" Throughout, the tone and tenor of the book has many resemblances to passages in the Zend Avesta.

It is evident from Acts 2: 9, that "Parthians and Medes, and Elamites," i. e. Jews from the region of those nations, were accustomed to frequent the great feasts at Jerusalem. What if we suppose our author to have been a descendant of the Jews, who had long been scattered over these regions; to have been an occasional worshipper at Jerusalem; to have gone up there at a time when Christians were persecuted by the Jews or Romans; to have been converted there to Christianity, and to have had some slight acquaint-

ance, from a cursory reading, with the records of this religion? We cannot, in the absence of positive and direct testimony, prove these to be facts; but we may say, without much danger of presumption or even of errour, that these suppositions well accord with the internal state of the book of Enoch. Farther than this, the devastations of time do not permit us to go.

But if it be supposed that the author was a Christian Jew, I shall be asked how we can account for it, that the incarnation, sufferings, and expiatory death of the Saviour, are not brought to view, nor any where insisted on in the work?

The question, I admit, presents some serious difficulty. But still, I do not apprehend that it can decide against so much internal evidence as has already been produced. I might appeal to the Old Testament prophecies, and ask: Where, except in Ps. xxii., Is. liii., and perhaps Ps. xl., are there any predictions of the sufferings and death of the Messiah, mere hints being exempted from this inquiry? A Jew, then, who was deeply versed in the Old Testament Scriptures, would be prone to think of his Messiah as King and Lord, as an irresistible conqueror, and possessed of universal dominion. So he appears in the book of Enoch. So, I may add, (and this is more directly to my purpose,) does he appear almost entirely throughout the Apocalypse. Whatever is different from this, appears to be *incidental*, rather than a part of the main design. And, as I have already hinted more than once, the main design of the book of Enoch and of the Apocalypse, is similar in a striking degree. To console the righteous under affliction, and to intimidate the wicked, is the leading object of both. What wonder then, with an imperfect knowledge of Christianity, and with the Old Testament predictions respecting the Messiah in his eye, the writer of the book of Enoch should present the *Son of Man* to his readers, as Judge and Lord of the world, rather than in any other point of view? It was a natural effect of his condition and of his design.

As to the book itself, it comes before us under many disadvantages. It has been dislocated, in several of its parts; some of it, too, has been lost; at least we must judge so, when we compare some of the quotations of the fathers, with the present book of Enoch, as it comes before us from

the Ethiopic. Yet there are other passages quoted, so numerous and extensive, as to establish beyond all reasonable doubt, the *general* identity of the present book with that quoted and appealed to by the ancient Christian fathers. That we cannot find in it some things which are quoted, only proves that the book has suffered by the negligence of translators, or by the ravaging hand of time.

But I must withhold my hand. Of one thing I am sure; and this is, that every critic on the Apocalypse will most sincerely rejoice in the publication of this long-lost volume. It affords so many and such striking illustrations of particular passages; it gives such a clue to the angelology and demonology of the common people in the first century; it exhibits such a state of taste for the writing of visions and dreams; and such views of the Messiah and his dignity; that no writer on the New Testament can justify himself for neglecting the sources of illustration which it discloses.

I have confined myself in the present discussion mostly to one topic of which the book before us treats. There are other things in this work which ought to come before our religious public. The subject of *eternal punishment* of the wicked, is one that is often brought to view in this early production; and whether the book be Jewish or Christian, it will serve to give at least the views which were entertained, when the author wrote, in relation to this subject. Most fully does it accord with the Scriptures in regard to this matter. But I must take another opportunity, should it be deemed desirable, to illustrate and confirm this assertion.

I engaged, in the commencing part of this communication, to make some remarks on the quotation of Enoch by the apostle Jude. Under present circumstances these remarks must of necessity be brief.

Of the passage in Jude, Joseph Scaliger says: Ex hoc fragmento [i. e. ex Libro Enoch, which Syncellus has quoted], manifesto excerptus est; Not. in Euseb. p. 405. And so decide Fabricius, Grabe, Walton, and also most critics of the present day. Others, viz. Pfeiffer, Calovius, Pomarius, etc., suppose that the words apparently quoted by Jude, were immediately suggested by divine inspiration. Cave, Simon, Witsius, and many others, suppose that Jude has quoted a *traditional* saying or prophecy of Enoch. Taking this to be the case, they liken it to the tradition respecting the

dispute between Michael and Satan concerning the body of Moses, mentioned in Jude v. 9; or to the account of Jannes and Jambres who withstood Moses, as mentioned in 2 Tim. 3: 8. Jude might have known something of the prophecy of Enoch, in the like way that he came to the knowledge of something respecting the contest of Michael and Satan, or as Paul came to his knowledge respecting the contest with Moses, i. e. in all probability, by traditional communication.

The *possibility* of this will not be denied. The *probability*, however, that such a prophecy of Enoch had been perpetuated in this way, has been denied, and strongly controverted. Yet I am unable to see what there is of *improbability* in it. Enoch was surely a very distinguished character, and his end equally distinguished. That some solemn and remarkable saying of his should have come down, through Noah, to his posterity, presents us with nothing strange or unexpected. That tradition could preserve this, as well as it did the poems of Homer, will not, I suppose, be confidently denied. Jude might have quoted this saying, from the same source as that from which the author of the Book of Enoch took it; and so neither of these writers be dependent on the other. I am rather inclined to this supposition; and the more, because the passage in Jude contains, as the reader may see by looking back and making the comparison, some considerable departure from that in the Book of Enoch.

But we will adopt, for the sake of argument, the opinion that the passage in Jude is a real quotation. Then the question arises: Does this *authenticate* the book of Enoch, and entitle it to a place in the canon? Why should it? When Paul quotes Aratus, in Acts 17: 28; or Menander, in 1 Cor. 15: 33; or Epimenides, in Tit. 1: 12; and when he not only quotes, but vouches for the truth of the sentiment quoted; does this *authenticate* the whole works of these three Greek poets? I trust not. A heathen book may have much truth in it, which an apostle might sanction. And yet it would contain many other things for which he would by no means vouch. And so it may be with the Book of Enoch. The prophecy ascribed to him, in the passage quoted, may be *truly* ascribed to him; and therefore the apostle might set his seal upon it. But this would no more involve an approbation of the whole book, than quotation involves this in the case where it is made by Paul. Even if it be asked: 'Why has not Jude

given us some caution against the Book of Enoch as a whole?' I might reply: Why has not Paul given us some caution against Aratus, Menander, and Epimenides?

In the preceding part of this communication, I have gone upon the ground that *quotation* is matter of fact in the case before us. Yet I have done so principally because this is, at present, altogether the predominant opinion among critics. Indeed, this opinion, it must be acknowledged, cannot well be disproved. The discrepancy between the passages in the two books, extending to several minute clauses, is still not enough to raise much serious doubt concerning quotation; for many passages of the New Testament, taken from the Old Testament, are quoted, as we well know, with even less exactness than is here apparent. Still, it is easy to see, that although the fact of quotation cannot be *disproved*, yet *neither can it be proved.* We can account for the resemblance between the two passages, on the ground of a *traditional preservation* of the brief prophecy of Enoch, which is ascribed to him in the book of Jude. In such a case, Jude and the author of Enoch both drew from one common source.

As to those who maintain a direct *suggestion* of the passage before us to Jude, by the Spirit of God, it might suffice to ask: Whether any accession, in such a case, is made to the weight and authority of the book? The Spirit, speaking by Jude, was as credible as the Spirit who spake by Enoch. But in case the apostle could truly superadd the weight of tradition in favor of what the Spirit directed him to regard as true, then one of the deepest toned chords in the heart of a Jew would be touched and moved, viz., his reverence for the sayings of remote ancestors.

That the book before us was translated out of a *Greek* copy into Ethiopic, there can scarcely be a doubt, on account of the shape of some of the original Greek words which are still retained in this translation. On the other hand; that the first and original language of the production was the later *Hebrew* of the times, I think we cannot well doubt. The names are so numerous, and withal are, almost without exception, so much of pure Hebrew origin; the style is so exclusively of the Jewish cast; the objects aimed at are so intimately connected with the welfare of the Hebrews; that, at all events, the author was at least of Jewish origin and education. With Laurence and Hartmann, I

must believe that the *original* language of the work was Hebrew. Of course we have, in our English Version by Laurence, only a translation in the third degree. Ours is a version of the Ethiopic, which was itself a version of the Greek; and this was a translation of the original Hebrew. It is impossible but that much of the light and shade of the original should have been removed by such a process. But still, as, in the third or fourth copies of Raphael or Salvator Rosa, a likeness to the original still remains, so in the present case there is much, nay most, of the peculiarities of the author which remains. This book is too strongly marked to suffer obliteration as to its leading traits, even by the most unskillful copyist.

At all events it seems probable, that the book of Enoch existed in the *Hebrew* language very early in the Christian era; for the book of Zohar repeatedly alludes to it, and even names it; and this book, although the time of its origin cannot be definitely ascertained, is probably among the oldest of the Rabbinical writings which are extant. The quotations from it may be found in Laurence's Preliminary Dissertations, p. 21 seq. But these serve not merely to shew that the book of Enoch was in repute among the Jews, and existed in all probability in Hebrew, but that in early times it was well known and widely diffused. The matter quoted from it in the Zohar, is still contained in the copies of the book of Enoch that now exist.

I cannot conclude this communication without making a remark that has often been suggested to my mind by the reading of early apocryphal books. It is this, viz., that if any one wishes to know the real excellence of the New Testament writers, in a *comparative* respect, let him read the other writers of the first and second centuries, respecting matters of religion. If he does not find the Gospels and Epistles standing at an immeasurable distance from all other ecclesiastical productions of the age, and in all respects superior to them—then I can only say, that he must read with feeling and judgment exceedingly different from mine. I doubt whether any man knows, or can know well, how to prize the Gospels and Epistles, in an æsthatical point of view, until he has compared the other productions of early ages carefully with them. The result will compensate him richly for performing the task.

ARTICLE VI.

THE SONSHIP OF CHRIST, AS TAUGHT IN ROM. 1: 3, 4.

By Rev. Lewis Mayer, D. D., York, Pa.

Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.

THIS passage is considered peculiarly interesting, as giving a clear exhibition of the Apostle's view of the character of Christ, and of the import of the term Son of God. "There are," it is said, "three leading interpretations of it. 1. According to the first, the meaning is, Jesus Christ was, as to his human nature, the Son of David; but was clearly demonstrated to be, as to his divine nature, the Son of God, by the resurrection from the dead. 2. According to the second, the passage means, Christ was in his humiliation, the Son of David, but was constituted the Son of God in his exaltation, by the resurrection from the dead, or after his resurrection. 3. According to the third, Christ was the Son of David according to his human nature, but was declared to be the Son of God, agreeably to the Scriptures, by his resurrection from the dead." *See Prof. Hodge's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.*

The author of the Commentary here referred to, adopts the first of these interpretations, and defends it on the following grounds: 1. The sense which it assigns to the several clauses may be justified by usage, and is required by the context; 2. It is favored by the structure of the passage; 3. It is accordant with what is elsewhere taught of the Sonship of Christ, John 5: 17, Ep. 10: 30—33, Heb. 1: 4—8; 4. This interpretation should be adopted, because the others are pressed with serious, if not fatal objections.

The second and third of these interpretations are easily and briefly disposed of by the learned author, as erroneous and untenable: but the refutation of these does not, as he

seems to suppose, establish the first, which appears to me not less erroneous. That interpretation is by no means the only one that is possible, after the other two have been exploded; and I beg leave, respectfully to propose another. But before another interpretation is proposed, I shall, with deference toward those brethren, from whom I am constrained to differ, give my reasons for rejecting that one which the learned and estimable Commentator maintains to be the only true one.

The primary error of this interpretation, from which the rest necessarily follow, consists in taking the terms *flesh* and *Spirit of holiness* to designate some things in Christ himself, constituents of his person or character; not things distinct from and external to him. If the flesh, according to which Christ is the Son of David, be his humiliation, then, by the rule of antithesis, the Spirit of holiness must be his exaltation. If the flesh be his human nature, then, by the same rule, the Spirit of holiness must be his divine nature. All the consequences that are legitimately deduced from this position must then be admitted, and, whatever they may be, the interpreter is obliged to defend them. He must then give to every other part of this text, and to every other text in the Bible, a meaning which will be, at least, not inconsistent with this interpretation. The learned Commentator assumes that the flesh is the human nature of Christ, and then argues that the Spirit of holiness is his divine nature, and that Christ is, according to this nature, the Son of God. His proofs, that the term Spirit of holiness means the divine nature of Christ, are the following.

1. The term Spirit is obviously applicable to the nature of God, and the word holiness, which here qualifies it adjectively, expresses every thing in God which is the foundation of reverence. It therefore exalts the idea expressed by *Spirit*. 'According to that spiritual essence in Christ, which is worthy of the highest reverence.'

2. The divine nature in Christ is elsewhere called Spirit, etc. etc. (Here the author refers to, and comments upon Heb. 9: 14 and 1 Pet. 3: 18.)

3. The antithesis obviously demands this interpretation. As to the flesh, Christ was the Son of David; as to the Spirit, the Son of God: if the flesh means his human, the Spirit must mean his divine nature.

4. It is confirmed by a comparison with ch. 9: 5, where the two natures in Christ are also brought into view and contrasted; as to the flesh, he was an Israelite, but as to his higher nature, he is God over all and blessed for ever.

I cannot perceive any weight or force in the first of these proofs. The phrase *Spirit of holiness* is a Hebraistic mode of expression, very common in the original text of the holy Scriptures, especially of the Old Testament, instead of *Holy Spirit.* In the original text we have *Son of his love*, for his beloved Son, Col. 1: 13. *Body of this death*, for this dead body, Rom. 7: 24. *In the likeness of the flesh of sin*, for in the likeness of the sinful flesh, Rom. 8: 3. *The hill of my holiness*, for my holy hill, Ps. 2: 6; and other innumerable examples. If the Spirit of holiness be the Holy Spirit, he is not the divine nature of Jesus, unless that nature and the Holy Spirit be one and the same, which the learned author will not admit.

The reference to Heb. 9: 14, is not relevant to the subject. The sacred writer says in that place, "If the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your consciences from dead works to serve the living God." The Commentator substitutes for the common translation, *through the eternal Spirit*, the words, *with an eternal Spirit*, which he thinks gives a better sense, and is more suitable to the context. He refers to Rom 2: 27, and to *Wahl's Clavis*, for his authority to render the Greek preposition διὰ, with a genitive case, by the English preposition *with*, in the sense of *having*, i. e. having an eternal spirit, and tells us, the sense of the text is, Christ offered himself a sacrifice to God with an eternal spirit; that is, having a divine nature. The phrase which is translated the eternal Spirit, he renders indefinitely, *an eternal Spirit*, on no other ground that I can perceive, than because the article is wanting in the Greek text. But the term *eternal Spirit* is sufficiently definite in itself, and may therefore, like θεὸς, and other terms of the same kind, either take the article or omit it. He might on the same ground, translate θεὸς ἐφανερωθη, a god was manifested, 1 Tim. 3: 16; θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λογος, The Word was a god; John 1: 1. The criticism on the Greek preposition is of

little value. The proper and ordinary signification of δια with a genitive case is *through*, or *by*, denoting the cause, instrument, means, or manner of a thing. It occurs in the first *five* chapters of Romans *thirty-seven* times. Of these it is translated in twenty-four instances by the English preposition *by*, and twelve times by *through*. In one place, ch. 4: 11, the English version has not expressed it. It may be there rendered by *in*. Abraham it is there said, received the sign of circumcision, as a seal of the righteousness of faith ἐν τῃ ἀκροβυστια, in uncircumcision, that he might be the father of all believers δια ἀκροβυστιας, in uncircumcision. Here, as also in ch. 5: 10, 17, it is interchanged with ἐν, *in*, and a dative case. Δια, however, still preserves its radical meaning *through*, denoting a being *in* something, with continuance *throughout*. In ch. 2: 27, the apostle says, "And the natural uncircumcision which keeps the law, shall judge thee, who διὰ γράμματος και περιτομης, in the literal circumcision, being in the state of circumcision, *throughout* the continuance of that state, art a transgressor, etc. The obvious meaning of δια πνευματος αιωνιου, *through the eternal Spirit*, is *through the suggestion, the influence, the motion* of the Holy Spirit, who influenced and moved Jesus Christ to offer himself a sacrifice to God.

The text in 1 Pet. 3: 18, is admitted to be parallel in the use of the terms *flesh* and *spirit*. I shall pay attention to it in the proper place.

The third proof, founded upon the rule of antithesis, would be valid, if it were first shewn that the term flesh must mean the human nature of Christ.

The text in Rom. 9: 5, is not parallel, inasmuch as the antithesis of *flesh* and *spirit* does not occur in it: it has indeed the former term κατα σαρκα, but not the latter, κατα πνευμα. Neither is it at all necessary to interpret κατα σαρκα, *according to the human nature of Christ;* for it may doubtless mean, *according to his human descent or natural birth.*

That the term Spirit of holiness does not designate the divine nature of Christ, and that his Sonship is not in his divinity, is evident from the fact that he was declared to be the Son of God *by his resurrection*. I admit with the learned Commentator that the Greek word which is rendered *was declared*, is rightly translated, and does not mean *made* or *constituted;* because Christ was the Son of God before

he arose from the dead; and was not *made* such by his resurrection, but was declared, exhibited, and proved to be such by that event. The words ἐν δυναμει, *in* or *with power*, may be connected either, as they are in our translation, with the term *Son of God*, or with the participle *declared*. Connected in the former of these ways, the sense will be, that the resurrection proved Jesus to be the Son of God invested with power: in the latter connection the meaning is that the resurrection was a powerful declaration or proof that Jesus was the Son of God. This seems to be the true sense, because it is not so clear that the resurrection proved that Jesus was invested with power, as that it proved powerfully that he was the Son of God, in the sense which I shall hereafter shew to be the true one.

Jesus Christ was declared, shewn, or proved, to be the Son of God by his resurrection from the dead. But this event was no proof at all that Jesus Christ was God. All the saints shall be raised after the similitude of Christ. He preceded them, and is pre-eminent among them, as the "First-born from the dead," and the "First fruits of them that slept;" but they all shall be conformed to his image; they shall follow him, every man in his order: first Christ the first-fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming. See Rom. 8: 17, 29, Col. 1: 18, 1 Cor. 15: 20—23, 1 Cor. 15: 47—49. The resurrection of the saints, the redemption of their bodies, the waking up of the people of God, soul and body, to a new life after death, is their adoption as sons of God; the declaring, shewing, or proving them to be the children of God. Rom. 8: 22, 23. But no one will imagine that the resurrection of the saints proves that they are divine.

The learned author of the Commentary was sensible of this difficulty, and endeavored to solve it by the following comment on this part of the text, "That is, the resurrection of Christ was the great decisive evidence that he was the Son of God; it was the public acknowledgement of God, of the validity of all the claims, which Christ had made. Hence the apostles were appointed witnesses of that fact. Acts 1: 22. This, of course, does not at all imply that the resurrection of Christ in itself was any proof that he was the Son of God, any farther than it was a proof that he was all that he had claimed to be, and as, in its attending circumstances, it was

a display of his divine power. He had power to lay down his life, and he had power to take it again."

But how was the resurrection of Jesus a display of his own divine power? The text in John, ch. 10: 17, 18, shews, indeed, that he possessed authority over his own life, to lay it down in order that he might take it again; but two things must be borne in mind here: 1. Jesus describes this authority as one which he had received from the Father, and which he, as the Son, did not, therefore, originally possess: 2. What is here said by our Lord must be understood in a sense that will be in harmony with the doctrine of the apostles, who uniformly ascribe his resurrection to God the Father, or to his Spirit. See Acts 2: 24, 32, ch. 3: 15, 26, ch. 4: 10, ch. 10: 40, ch. 13: 30—37, ch. 17: 31, Rom. 4: 24, ch. 6: 4, ch. 8: 11, ch. 10: 9, 1 Cor. 6: 14, 2 Cor. 4: 14, Gal. 1: 1, Eph. 1: 19, 20, 1 Thes. 1: 10, Heb. 13: 20, 1 Pet. 1: 3, 21. The resurrection of Jesus was therefore, indeed, a display of divine power; but it was of the power of God, not of the Son of God. I grant that it was, in the circumstances of the case, a public acknowledgement of God of all the claims which Jesus had made, and, I will add, of all the explanations which he had given: and if he had so explained the appellation *Son of God* as to shew that he used it as a title of divinity, his resurrection would, in this way, be a proof that he was divine with respect to his Sonship. But such an explanation he has nowhere given, and his resurrection, therefore, cannot prove it.

It is alleged, however, that the New Testament does contain explanations of the term *Son of God* which shew that it belongs to the divine nature of Jesus and designates the relation which that nature sustains to God the Father. The respected Commentator before referred to, says,

"If there is nothing in the usage of the term *son*, or of the phrase *Sons of God*, which can fix definitely the meaning of the phrase now in question, we must advert to those cases in which either the ground of the appellation is distinctly stated, or its true import explained. These cases are, of course, comparatively few. Christ is called Jesus in a multitude of instances, but the reason of his being so called is stated in but one or two. In like manner he is very frequently called the Son of God, but why he is so called, we can learn only from the few cases just referred to. In this passage, for example (Rom. 1, 3. 4.) it seems to be definitely asserted that Christ is the Son of God, as to his divine nature; and, of course, the ground of his being so called must be the

relation between that nature and the eternal Father. In John 5: 17, Christ calls God his Father in such a way as to imply that he is equal with God. This is the interpretation which his hearers put upon his words, and one which Christ himself confirmed. The same is the case in John 10: 30—39, where Christ declares himself to be the Son of God in such a sense that he and the Father are one. In John 1: 14, the glory of Christ, which proved him to be God, is said to be his glory as of the only begotten Son of the Father. Compare v. 18. In Heb. 1: 4—7, it is argued, in effect, that because Christ is called Son, he is God; higher than the angels, and worthy of their worship. These and other passages prove that Christ is called the Son of God because he is of the same nature with the Father, and sustains to him a mysterious relation, as God, which lays the foundation of the appellation."

I am unable to discover in these texts the proof of the divinity of the Sonship of Christ which this esteemed brother alleges to be contained in them. The text in Romans, ch. 1: 3, 4, shall be considered presently. The sense which the Commentator puts upon it cannot be assumed as the true one, when the question is what it means.

The place in John, ch. 5: 17, must be taken in connection with the passage in which it stands. Jesus having healed the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda on the Sabbath day, the Jews charged him with a criminal violation of the sanctity of the day, and sought for that reason to put him to death. The design of Jesus was to prove his innocence of the crime of violating any law of God; and for this purpose he says to them, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." Upon this the Jews sought the more to kill him, because, as the apostle tells us, he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said that God was his Father, making himself equal with God." Did John believe that Jesus had broken the Sabbath? Certainly not. Neither, therefore, did he believe that Jesus made himself equal with God, in the sense in which the Jews understood him, or affected to understand him. In his judgment the allegation that Jesus had made himself equal with God, in their sense, by saying that God was his Father, was about as true as the charge that he had broken the Sabbath by healing the impotent man. The answer of Jesus shews what sort of equality he meant: it was an equality *quoad hoc:* an equality consisting in this, that both the Father and he wrought on the Sabbath day. "Then answered Jesus, Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for

whatsoever things he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." In v. 30, he repeats the declaration, "I can do nothing of myself." And elsewhere he refers all his miracles, as well as his doctrines, to the Father who was in him, "My Father, which dwelleth in me, he doeth the works;" John 14: 10, 11. By the Father who dwelt in him, who wrought his miracles, imparted his doctrine, and controlled him in all things, it seems evident that Jesus meant the Godhead which was united with him; not occasionally visiting him, as he visited the prophets when they received his inspirations, but abiding in him, and mysteriously united with him.* This Godhead he calls his Father, and from it dis-

* The union of the man Jesus Christ is specifically with the WORD, the Logos: "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us." John i. 14. Of this Word or Logos the apostle says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." There is therefore a sense in which the Word is distinct from God, and can be said to be *with* God; and there is a sense also in which he is not distinct, but the same: "The Word *was* God." It is in this latter sense that Jesus views the Word when, instead of saying, "The Word which is in me," he says, "The Father who is in me;" meaning by the term Father the Godhead. So, also, the apostle Paul viewed the Word, or Logos, when he said, "God was in Christ."—"God was manifested in the flesh."—"Of whom Christ came, who is God over all, blessed for ever." That it was not one distinction only in the Godhead, but the whole Godhead, (if the expression may be allowed) that was united with the man Jesus, is plain from those words of Paul; "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Col. ii. 9. *All the fulness of the Godhead* cannot be one distinction in it, exclusive of the two other distinctions, unless it be that each of the three distinctions be a mere mode or aspect of the same fulness. The same view is taken in all the places, so far as I remember, where this apostle speaks of the divinity in Christ; for he makes no distinction between that divinity and the Jehovah who was the object of worship to the Israelites. See 2 Cor. v. 19, 1 Tim. iii. 16, Rom. ix. 5, Act. xx. 28. Titus ii. 14, in the Greek Testament. Compare also 1 Cor. x. 9. with Numbers xxi. 5—9, and Heb. i. 10—12; with Ps. cii. 24—27. So also the apostle John identifies the divinity of Christ with the Jehovah of the Old Testament, where speaking of Christ, he quotes the words of Isaiah, ch. vi. 9, 10; and referring to the

tinguishes himself as the Son. It was God, his Father, that spake through him and wrought miracles. The Son, as such, could of his own self do nothing. He claimed only to be the instrument of God in executing the great purpose of the salvation of man. He possessed, indeed, a distinct, intelligent nature, an understanding and a will of his own, but so perfectly assenting to every purpose of God, that he never deviated from his will; and in all things that belonged to his mediatorial office, he acted only so far, and at such times, as he perceived the indwelling Godhead acting in him, and moving him to act. If he perceived this motion on the Sabbath day, he wrought on that day; if not, he refrained. This is what he means, when he says, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." The miracle was not his own, but was the work of God, who could do no wrong; and all the indignation of the querulous Jews was therefore uncalled for, and impious. In this text Jesus has not directly explained the import of the title *Son of God*, but he has clearly shewn that, in assuming it, so far from claiming that equality with God which the interpretation we are opposing ascribes to him, he entirely disclaims it.

---

vision which the prophet had of Jehovah, he says, "These things said Isaiah when he saw his glory and spake of him." John xii. 38—41. Jehovah and the Word or Logos are therefore one and the same. So again Jesus himself, while he ordinarily speaks of the divinity within him, by which his miracles were wrought, as the Father, says in another place, Matth. xii. 28: "If I cast out demons *by the spirit of God*;" which in Luke is expressed: "If I *by the finger of God* cast out demons." Luke xi. 20. So finally John the Baptist, when Jesus was marked out to him as that man with whom the Godhead was united, saw the Holy Ghost descend upon him and remain upon him. John i. 31—33. I do not mean that this union then began; but that Jesus was then marked out as the man with whom it subsisted. The divinity in Christ is thus sometimes spoken of as God, or Jehovah, or the Father, sometimes as the Holy Ghost, and once specifically as the Word or Logos. We must therefore conclude that while in one respect, God, the Word, and the Holy Spirit are distinct, in another respect, they are one and the same: and that the union of Jesus with the Word is at the same time a union with the fulness of the Godhead.

In the place John 10: 30—39, Jesus called God his Father, and said, "I and my Father are one." The Jews then took up stones to stone him; and when he remarked to them, "Many good works have I shewn you of my Father; for which of these do ye stone me," they answered him, "For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy, and because thou, being a man, makest thyself God." If these captious Jews rightly represented the Lord's meaning, it amounts only to what he said in the place before commented upon; it was simply this, God is my Father, and he is united with me. He does not say that he was *equal* with the Father, but that he and the Father were *one*, were united with each other; as he elsewhere says, "The Father is in me, and I am in the Father." So far as he explains the meaning of the appellation Son of God, he says even the opposite of what the respected brother takes to be his meaning. He answered the Jews, "Is it not written in your law, I have said ye are Gods? If he called them Gods to whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken, say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?" In this reply he argues, that the title *god* was given by the highest authority, even by the Holy Scripture itself, to those men to whom the word of God came; that is, to messengers of God; and inasmuch as he was a messenger whom the Father had sanctified, or set apart, and sent to men in the world, he might at least claim the more modest title of Son of God. So far, therefore, from representing the term Son of God as a title of divinity, Jesus maintains, in this place, that any one who was honored with a commission from God, would be justified in assuming it.

The oneness with the Father of which the Lord speaks in v. 30, may be only a moral union, a union of purpose and will; for the connection demands nothing more: and Jesus has so *expressed* himself in his prayer, John 17: 21—23, "That they may be one in us, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us." But as the Scripture elsewhere affirms that *God was in Christ; that in him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*, etc., it is more probable that Jesus used the same terms in a higher sense when he spoke of his own union with God, and

in a lower when he spoke of the union of believers with him. Believers are one with God *after the similitude of Christ*, but not in precisely the same manner.

In the place John 1: 14, the apostle does not say that the glory of Christ, which was "as the glory of the only begotten of the Father," proved him to be God. His words are, "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, a glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." In the first verse, he tells us, "The Word was God." The phrase in v. 14, *The Word became flesh*, is therefore equivalent to the other terms, *God was in Christ—God was manifest in the flesh—I am in the Father and the Father in me.* The apostles did not see the *Word:* the *Word* was God, *whom no man hath seen at any time:* but they saw the man Jesus Christ; and the glory which they beheld, was the glory that shone forth in him: in all his teaching, his mighty works, his most holy life, and, more sensibly and impressively, in his transfiguration upon the mountain. Of this last mentioned exhibition of his glory only Peter and John and James his brother were permitted to be witnesses. What impression they received from it appears from Peter's reference to it in his second epistle, ch. 1: 16—18. Of James we have nothing in writing left us; for the author of the epistle under the same name was not the brother of John. This last named apostle doubtless has reference to the same event in the place now before us. This glory was "a glory as of the only begotten of the Father:" it was such a glory, the apostle means, as we could expect only in one who is the only begotten Son of God; it proved Jesus, therefore, to be the Son of God. But the question still remains unanswered. What does this appellation mean? Surely the apostle could not think, that the transfiguration of Jesus proved that he was God; at least he has not said so.

The text in verse 18, which we are requested to compare, is in these words, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." The expression, it will be admitted, is figurative. There is in it an allusion to the custom which assigned to the person most beloved by the chief or head of a family the next place below him, when they reclined at their table. To lean upon the bosom of another, or to be

in his bosom, meant, therefore, in its tropical acceptation, to be highly honored and beloved. So John leaned upon the bosom of Jesus. So Lazarus was in Abraham's bosom, at the feast in Paradise. The one was the most beloved among the disciples of Jesus, and the other the most favoured of the children of Abraham among believers. The text, therefore, designates Jesus as the object of God's most distinguishing love; and this, as I shall have occasion hereafter to remark, I take to be the true import of the term *Son of God.*

It is alleged that, in Heb. 1: 4—7, "it is argued, in effect, that, because Christ is called Son, he is God," etc. I cannot see the argument which the Commentator alleges to be contained in that place. It is argued, indeed, that, because Christ is called the Son, he is higher than the angels, and worthy of their worship; that is, of their homage and reverence, as their superior and Lord; just as a king is entitled to the homage and reverence of his subjects: for so the word προσκυνεω signifies in a multitude of places. But this is far from arguing that he is, for the same reason, God.

In v. 8, 9, of the same place, the sacred author says, "But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Here the Son is addressed by the title *God;* but the context shews that it is an official title, which designates him as a king: he has a kingdom, a throne and a sceptre; and in v. 9, he is compared with other kings, who are called his fellows; but God can have no fellows. As the Son, therefore, he is classed with the kings of the earth, and his superiority over them consists in this, that he is anointed with the oil of gladness above them; inasmuch as their thrones are temporary, but his shall be everlasting.

These are all the texts to which the learned and much respected author of the Commentary has referred us; and it cannot now, I think, but be evident, how much he errs in the remark with which our quotation from his work closes, "These and other passages prove that Christ is called the Son of God, because he is of the same nature with the

Father, and sustains to him a mysterious relation, as God, which lays the foundation of the appellation." All the proof which they contain, with reference to the question at issue, is on the other side.

On the other hand there is a very large class of texts which, either directly or by implication, make the Son of God inferior to the Father and dependent from him.

1. The Son *prays* to the Father, "Father, the hour is come: glorify thy Son, that thy Son may also glorify thee," etc. John 17: 1. "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me," etc. John 11: 41. He prays as the Son; prays that he may be glorified or honored by the Father as the Son. This certainly implies that, as the Son, he is dependent.

2. He avows his inferiority to the Father and his dependence from him, "If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said unto you, I go to my Father; *for my Father is greater than I.*" John 14: 28. "Of that day, and that hour knoweth no man; no not the angels in heaven, *nor the Son*, but my Father only." Mark 13: 32. "The Son can do nothing of himself," etc. John 5: 19. "To sit on my right hand and on my left *is not mine to give;* but it shall be given to them for whom *it is prepared of my Father.*" Matth. 20: 23.

3. When the Son claims authority and power, he always, represents them as received by donation from the Father, and, consequently, not originally and essentially his own. "All things *are delivered* unto me of my Father." Matth. 11: 27. "All power *is given* unto me in heaven and in earth." Matth. 28: 18. "As the Father hath life in himself, *so hath he given to the Son* to have life in himself. And *hath given him* authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man." John 5: 26, 27. "The living Father hath sent me, and *I live by the Father.*" John 6: 57. "If I honor myself, my honor is nothing: *it is my Father that honoreth me*, of whom ye say that he is your God." John 8: 54. "No man taketh it (my life) from me, but I lay it down of myself: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. *This commandment have I received of my Father.*" John 10: 18. The power which the Son has over all flesh, to bestow eternal life on the people of God, *is a power which the Father has given him.* The disciples, for whom he prayed, were the

men *whom the Father had given him* out of the world. All those on whom he was to bestow eternal life, *were given to him by the Father* for that purpose. John 17: 2, 3, 6.

4. The Son is subordinate and subject to the Father. "I came down from heaven, (came with a commission from the Father who is in heaven) *not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.* And this is the Father's will which hath sent me," etc. John 6: 38—40. "For *I have not spoken of myself*, but the Father which sent me, *he gave me a commandment* what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting; whatsover I speak, therefore, *even as the Father said unto me*, so I speak." John 12: 49, 50. "I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work *which thou gavest me to do.*" John 17: 4. "God so loved the world, that *he gave his only begotten Son*," etc. John 3: 16.

5. It was the Son of God that was given; the Son that was sent; the Son that was born, that agonized in Gethsemane, that died upon the cross, that was raised from the dead by the Father, was exalted to the right hand of God, *was constituted* the head of the church, etc. Nothing of all this can be predicated of divinity; and it, consequently, shews that, as the Son of God, Jesus is a man.

The apostles have given the same view of his Sonship. One or two texts only must suffice here.

"So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high-priest, but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son: to-day have I begotten thee. As also he saith in another place, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek. Who in the days of his flesh offered up prayers and supplications to him that was able to deliver him from death, and was heard in that which he feared, *though he was a Son*, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered. And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him." Heb. 5: 5—9. All this is said of Jesus as the Son of God. He did not glorify himself, but was glorified by the Father; he did not constitute himself a priest but was made such; both his Sonship and his priesthood were derived from the Father's good pleasure. As the Son he desired to be delivered from death; as the Son he prayed to the Father who alone could save him from it; as the Son he suffered, and learned obedience by

his sufferings; as the Son he was made perfect, and was constituted the author of salvation, by the will of the Father. Is it possible that the inspired author, who wrote these things, could have thought at the same time that, as the Son, Jesus is God? Certainly not. Every sentence in this passage shews that, with regard to his Sonship, he considered him a man.

"Then cometh the end, when he (Christ) shall deliver the kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall abolish all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign until he put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy who shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, All things have been subjected, it is manifest that he is excepted who did subject all things to him. And when all things shall be subject to him, then *the Son himself also shall be subject* to him who hath subjected all things unto him, *that God may be all in all.*" 1 Cor. 15: 24—28. Here the apostle describes the glory of the Son of God, in his universal reign over the creatures of God, as one which God the Father had given him; for it is he that put all things under his feet; and in his highest glory he, as the Son, is still subject to the Father, and the Father is all in all: all in the Son, as well as in every creature in the universe. Can it be that, when St. Paul gave this account of the Son of God, he considered him, as the Son, divine and equal with the Father? Certainly not. He has told us elsewhere, that God was in Christ, that all the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in him bodily, that he was God over all, blessed for ever, etc; but he has not said that *the Son* of God was in Christ, or that the indwelling divinity was *the Son.* When he speaks of the Son, and designedly communicates his idea of him, he makes him the man whom God freely gave for us all; who died for us; who was raised again from the dead; whom God hath highly exalted, and honored with a name above every name; to whom God hath subjected all things, and who is, in every thing, subject to God. How shall we reconcile this with the theory that the apostles used the term *Son of God* as a title of divinity and designated by it the divine nature of Christ and his equality with the Father? If they had used the term in this sense, and for this purpose, it must occur ordinarily, in their writings, in connection with

predicates which can belong only to divinity. But instead of this it usually occurs with predicates that can be affirmed only of a man: and if it seem to be used, in some places, as a title of divinity, those texts are easily explicable, as we have already seen in those to which our attention has been called, on the contrary supposition.

The respected brother to whom reference has already been made, anticipating this argument, replies to it thus:

"When Christ calls himself the Son of God, he claims equality with God; and when he is so called by the sacred writers, this equality is ascribed to him. It is not at all necessary, in order to make out the correctness of this remark, to shew that, in every instance, reference is had to his divine nature. Is it necessary to prove that the appellation *Son of man* has uniformly reference to his human nature, in order to shew that it properly implies that Christ is a man? These and all other designations of Christ, no matter what their origin or import, are frequently used to designate his person. Hence the Son is said to give life, to judge, to be put to death, to be ignorant of the day of judgment, to be subject to the Father, etc. In all these cases no reference is had to the import of the term Son, or to the original ground of its application. It is a mere personal designation. In like manner Christ is said to be God, to have died upon the cross, to have arisen from the dead, etc. The Son of man is said not to have where to lay his head, to be in heaven, etc. The fact, therefore, that the term Son is often applied to designate the person of Christ, even when the immediate reference is to his human nature, cannot prove that the original ground of its application is not his relation, as God, to the Father; or that its application does not involve the assumption or ascription of equality with God."

But why must we hold that the title Son of God involves this assumption, or this ascription? Nothing of this kind is supposed to be involved in it when believers are called sons and daughters of God. We are told, indeed, in another place, that, inasmuch as Jesus Christ is not called *a* Son, but *the* Son, the use of the definite article, when the application of the title is made to him, shews that he is the Son of God in a sense peculiar to himself, and in which there can be no other Son of God, and, consequently, in a sense in which he is equal with the Father. But how can this consequence follow? A son is not necessarily equal with his father. In some respects he never can be equal with him: he must necessarily be younger than his father; neither does the father derive his existence from the son, but the son from the father. But, passing over this ground

of objection, we call Homer *the* poet, and Demosthenes *the* orator, and the first William of the kings of England *the* conqueror. Does this phraseology imply that there have been no other poets, or orators, or conquerors? The use of the definite article with the title Son of God, when it is applied to Christ, does indeed designate him as sustaining the relation of sonship in a sense peculiar to himself; but the difference, which it marks between him and other sons, is not a difference of nature, but a difference of measure.

We are told that, "when Christ calls himself the Son of God, or when he is so called by the sacred writers, it is not at all necessary to shew that, in every instance, reference is had to his divine nature." And it is admitted that "the term Son is often applied to him, even when the immediate reference is to his human nature." If this worthy brother had examined somewhat more closely, he would, perhaps, have discovered, that when this title is applied to Christ, the immediate reference is, at least ordinarily, if not always, to his human nature. But ought this to be so? ought there to be any thing like it? Ought not the immediate reference to be, if not always, at least usually, to the divine nature, if Christ meant to claim, or his apostles to ascribe to him divinity, by the title Son of God?

I admit that the appellations Son of man, Christ, and Son of God, when they are given to the Redeemer, are used as personal designations, not only frequently, but, perhaps, always; but I am not prepared to say that they are often so used without regard to their proper import, or the original ground of their application.

The title Son of man was assumed and very frequently used by the Lord himself, but was scarcely ever applied to him by other persons. It occurs only once in the Acts, and not at all in the Epistles. In the first three Gospels it is the common appellation by which the Lord designates himself, while the title Son of God is rarely used by him; but in the gospel of John the latter is much the more frequent of the two.

There is but one place where the import of the term Son of man, and the ground of its application, seem to be neglected. It is the text John 3: 13. "No man hath ascended into heaven, but he that came down from heaven; even the Son of man who is in heaven." This text seems to ascribe

omnipresence to the Son of man, and to oblige us, therefore, to take this appellation as a mere personal designation, a mere name, without reference to its appropriate meaning. The words, however, were evidently spoken in a tropical sense; for in their literal acceptation they have no consistent meaning. For what purpose should Jesus introduce the mention of his omnipresence in such a place? And how are we to understand his ascension into heaven? As to his human nature he had not yet ascended; and as to the divine nature he could not ascend. This verse must not be separated from its connection. In the preceding one Jesus had said to Nicodemus, "If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how will you believe if I tell you heavenly things?" The figurative idea which is conceived, is that of a royal council and a council-chamber in heaven, where the affairs of the kingdom of God are discussed, and purposes are decreed. Some of these decrees are sent down to mankind on earth by messengers of God, inspired men, and thus become things on earth; that is, things revealed and known to men, or accessible to them; but other decrees are still reserved in heaven, as secrets of state, and are known only to the king and to those who are in his confidence and intimacy. Compare Deut. 30: 11, 12. Jesus had told Nicodemus of earthly things, of things already revealed through the prophets, such as the necessity of a new birth, a new heart and a new spirit; and because Nicodemus was slow to believe him, he asked, by way of rebuke, "How will ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things?—Of things which are yet among the mysteries of God? And to assure this Jewish ruler that no other person could make those heavenly things known to men, he remarked, "No man hath ascended into heaven," etc. The sense of these words is, therefore, no other than this. No man has entered into the secret counsels of God which are reserved in heaven, but he that came down, as it were, from heaven, with a commission from God, to make them known; even the Son of man, who is intimate with God and has access to his secret purposes.

When the Son of man is said to have power on earth to forgive sins, to be Lord of the Sabbath day, to come in the glory of his Father, i. e. in the glory which his Father will impart, we must bear in mind the explanations which are

given in the same place, or elsewhere, that these things are derived by donation from the Father. St. Paul represents all the glory of Jesus as the reward which God has given him for his voluntary submission to the death of the cross. Philip. 2: 6—11.

The title Christ seems to be applied in the manner represented by the respected brother in Romans, ch. 9: 5, "Whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is God over all, blessed for ever." The term Christ seems here to designate that in the Redeemer which is not flesh, namely his divinity, and consequently to be used without regard to its proper meaning. The text does most clearly ascribe divinity to him in the highest sense; but the title *Christ* designates not that divinity, but the man who was descended from the Father, and was anointed to be the prophet, the priest and the king of the people of God, and in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwells.

The proper name, Jesus Christ, seems in like manner to be used without reference to its import in Heb. 13: 8. "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." This text, however, does not speak of the divinity of Christ at all. The sense of it is, that Jesus Christ, *the anointed Saviour*, is always the same Saviour, and will save, at all times, on the same terms, and in the same triumphant manner, those who believe in him.

The title Son of God is used in the same manner as the other two: it designates the person of Jesus with reference to its appropriate meaning. It is applied to Jesus Christ, as well as to all the children of God, in a tropical sense. Its import is *the beloved of God.* It designates Jesus Christ neither as God nor as man, but as the object of the love of God. In the common Hebrew usage *my son* was a term of endearment. See Heb. 12: 5 - 8. Prov. 3: 11, 12. ch. 6: 1, 3. ch. 23: 26. ch. 24: 21. ch. 27: 11. 1 Sam. 3: 6. ch. 4: 16. ch. 24: 16. Chap. 26: 17, 21. 1 Chron. 17: 13. Jer. 31: 20. Hosh. 11: 1. Matth. 3: 17. ch. 17: 5. Exod. 4: 22. St. Paul uses the term *my little children,* Gal. 4: 19, but in 1 Cor. 4: 14, instead of it, he says, *My beloved sons.* The compellation, *little children, my little children,* is frequent in the first epistle of John; and this is interchanged with the term *beloved.* See 1 John 2: 1, 12, 18, 28. ch. 3: 7, 18.

ch. 4: 4. ch. 5: 21. Compared with ch. 3: 2, 21. ch. 4: 1, 7, 11.

When believers are called the children of God, or the sons and daughters of God, they are thereby designated as those whom God specially loves; and care is therefore taken to distinguish their relation to God from that of servants, who may be loved and kindly treated, but can never aspire, in this respect, to the privileges of sonship. St. Paul says to the Romans, "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father." Rom. 8: 14, 15. Compare Gal. 4: 1--8. And the Apostle John exhorts believers to contemplate the greatness of the love which God had manifested toward them in calling them his children. "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God!" 1 John 3: 1. This term has other significations also, but the idea of the love subsisting between a parent and his children is primary, and is always implied where the term occurs in one of its other meanings.

When Jesus Christ is called *the Son of God*, the article *the* is emphatic, and distinguishes him from all other children of God, as most eminently the object of God's love. The import of the term is both explained and strengthened, when he is called the *beloved* Son, and God's *dear* son. ὑίος της αγαπης αὐτης, *Son of his love.* So also by the clause, "In whom I am well pleased:" ἐν ῳ ευδοκησα, *in whom I have complacency; in whom I take pleasure.* And so when Jesus says, "The Father loves the Son." John 5: 20. See also John 3: 35. Ephes. 1: 6.

Jesus is called "the first-begotten," in Hebrews 1: 6, and "the first-born among many brethren," Rom. 8: 29. This title assigns to him brethren, who, like himself, are children of God; but it gives him a pre-eminence above them all, similar to that of the first-born son in a family, whose prerogative it was to have a double portion of the paternal estate, to officiate as the priest of the family, and to be the lord of his brethren. It designates Jesus as that Son of God whom the Father has honored most, and has appointed to be the Chief of the family of his children, the Prince and Ruler of the redeemed of the human race, the Head of his church.

He is called "The only begotten Son." This title, like the others, was in use among the Jews in a tropical signification, and was the strongest term by which they expressed their tenderness and love toward the object of that affection. So Isaac, the second of Abraham's sons, is called his *only begotten son*, Heb. 11: 17, and his *only son*, Gen. 22: 2, 16. The sense is, *his most beloved Son.* Hence the Greek translation which was made before the time of Christ, by Jews who spoke the Greek language and were familiar with the Hebrew idiom, renders the Hebrew in both of the last-mentioned places by ἀγαπητος, *the beloved:* and in Zechariah 12: 10, the clause, "And they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for an only son," is rendered by "And they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for *a beloved.*"

Josephus also calls Isaac the only begotten son of Abraham. *See Antiq. B.* 1. *Ch. XIII.* § 1. But the sense in which he understood this term appears, in the most satisfactory manner, from the terms in which he speaks of *Izates*, the son of *Monobazus*, king of Adiabene. "He (Monobazus, the king) had indeed Monobazus, his (Izates') elder brother, by Helena also, as he had other sons by other wives besides. Yet did he openly place all his affections *on this his only begotten son Izates:* which was the origin of that envy which his other brethren, by the same father, bare to him; while on this account they hated him more and more, and were all under great affliction that their father should prefer Izates before them." *Antiq. B. XX. Ch. II.* § 1. Josephus was cotemporary with the apostle John. He was a Jew, a priest, and a Pharisee. His usage of the term *only-begotten son*, settles the question about the *usus loquendi* of the Jews of that time, and shows most fully that its meaning is *the most beloved.*

This title is given to Jesus only in the writings of John, where it occurs in the gospel four times, and in the first epistle once. The other sacred writers have, doubtless, said the same thing; but they have used other terms, namely *the beloved Son*, and simply *the Son*, the Son of God. John differs from them in both conceiving and expressing the same idea more fully and forcibly; but not in adding any thing, on this point, to their doctrine.

This import of the term *Son of God* contains the reason of its application in all the places where it is used. We

must except, however, the Hebrew phrase in the Old Testament, בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים sons of the *Elohim*, which is equivalent to the simple term אֱלֹהִים denoting that order of higher intelligences to which, from their office of ministering spirits, the scriptures more usually give the appellation *angels*. See the article on the Scriptural idea of angels, in the Repository for October, 1838. vol. xii. p. 360.

Kings and Rulers are called gods and sons of the Most High, Ps. 82: 1, 6. "God standeth in the congregation of the *mighty;* he judgeth among the *gods*."—"I have said, ye are gods, and all of you are *children (sons) of the Most High*." And in 2 Sam. 7: 14, "I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son." This title designated them as the beloved, the favored ones of God. In that age when the religious sense of mankind referred every thing to the immediate agency of the deity; when little or nothing was known of rewards and punishments in another world, and the present life was, consequently, regarded as the period during which God dispenses his favors to those whom he loves, a prosperous life and elevated rank among men, were considered the marks and evidences of divine love and favor; and rulers and kings, being so highly exalted above others who were also blessed, were therefore viewed as those whom God most loved, and were in this view called the sons of God. If one king was exalted above the rest, and was honored with their homage, he was denominated *the first-born* of the kings of the earth, in allusion to the pre-eminence which the eldest son of a family enjoyed over the other children. See Ps. 89: 27.

Jesus tells the Pharisees that those were called gods to whom the word of God came, and that he, as one whom the Father had set apart, and sent to men in the world, with a commission from him to make his counsels known, might therefore be justly called the Son of God. To be called by the Deity to such an office was a distinction which marked out the person as one chosen and beloved of God, and thus made it right and fit that he should be honored with such a title.

The man Jesus Christ is called the Son of God, by way of eminence, with reference, 1. To his miraculous conception, Luke 1: 35; 2. With regard to his resurrection, Rom. 1: 3, 4; 3. With regard to his regal office, Heb. 1: 8, 9. Ps. 2: 6—12.

John 1: 49. Luke 22: 69, 70. Mark 14: 61, 62. Matth. 26: 63, 64. In Matth. 16: 16, "Thou art the Christ, that is, *the anointed one*, is equivalent to John 1: 49, "Thou art the king of Israel:" for every lawful king of Israel was the Lord's anointed. Ps. 2: 2. 1 Sam. 16: 6. Ch. 24: 6. 2 Sam. 19: 21. Lament. 4: 20. Each of these particulars marked him out as the chosen, the favored, the beloved one. Jesus was the only one of the sons of men that was conceived, without the intervention of natural causes, by a supernatural divine agency. This event distinguished him advantageously from all the rest of mankind, and marked him out as the object of God's peculiar favor and love. He was the first that rose from the dead: while all other men, even Abraham the friend of God, and Moses with whom he spake face to face, and David the man after God's own heart, with all the holy prophets, were left still to sleep profoundly in the grave, Jesus, and he only, was waked up from the dead, was raised from the grave, and saw no corruption. His resurrection on the third day was the work of God the Father; and it marked him out, with a most powerful demonstration, as the one who, among all who share in the love of God, is the chief beloved. As the king, "all things are put under his feet," by him who anointed him. "God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess, to the glory of God, that Jesus Christ is Lord." This high dignity is a favor above every favor which God has elsewhere bestowed; and it demonstrates that, among all the creatures of God, none is equally beloved with Jesus Christ.

We must add here another ground of the application of this title to Jesus, namely, the mysterious union subsisting between the man Jesus Christ and the Godhead; "The Word," which is God, "became flesh"—"Christ is God over all"—"God was in Christ"—"God was manifested in the flesh"—"In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily"—"He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father"—"I am in the Father and the Father in me"—"I and the Father are one." There is no such union elsewhere in the universe; God is not so united with any other man; nor

with any other intelligence. Christians are the temple of God; the Spirit of God dwells in them; they have fellowship with the Father; but it is no where said that all the fullness of the Godhead dwells in them bodily; and none of them can dare to say, "He that seeth me, hath seen the Father." This union was such that it was the Father that spake and taught in Christ, and it was the Father dwelling in him that wrought his works. The selecting of the man Jesus Christ from among the intelligent creatures of God, for such a connection with the Godhead, marked him out and set him apart from all created beings, as the one upon whom God has bestowed his most distinguished love, and the highest tokens of his approbation and favor: and on this ground, especially, may Jesus, therefore, be called the Son of God, and the only begotten Son.

On all these four grounds for the application to Jesus of this title, he is the Son in a sense in which there is no other Son of God; the beloved in such a sense that, in comparison with him, no other is beloved; but none of them will support the theory that, as the Son, he is equal with the Father: neither, indeed, is that theory at all consistent with any one of them. It will be perceived also that, on all these grounds, the title Son of God preserves its appropriate meaning. Instead, therefore, of saying, "when Christ calls himself the Son of God, he claims equality with God; and when he is so called by the sacred writers, this equality is ascribed to him," the esteemed brother should have said, When Christ calls himself the Son of God, he claims to be the object of God's special love; and when he is so called by the sacred writers, this distinction is ascribed to him.

When Jesus calls himself the Son of God he ordinarily speaks of himself as a man, and distinguishes between himself and God whom he calls the Father.* Hence this term

---

* Our Lord ordinarily calls the Deity Father instead of God. Seldom was he heard, in conversing with his disciples, to use the term God. His usual phrase is The Father, My Father, Your Father, My heavenly Father, Your Father which is in heaven, etc. See the sermon on the mount, in ch. 5: 6 and 7, of Matthew's gospel. In his conversations with the Jews or the Samaritans, in the gospel of John, the title Father is often interchanged with and explained by the title God. See John 4:

is often interchanged with the term Son of Man, which is acknowledged to be a designation of humanity; and is so interchanged with it as to shew that the latter is, in this respect, equivalent to the former. When the high-priest adjured Jesus by the living God, saying, "Tell us whether thou be the Christ, *the Son of God:*" Jesus answered, "Thou hast said: nevertheless, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see *the Son of Man* sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." In Mark the question is, "Art thou the Christ, *the Son of the Blessed?*" And Jesus answers, "I am; and ye shall see *the Son of Man* sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." Luke's account is thus: "Art thou the Christ? Tell us. And he said unto them, If I tell you, ye will not believe me; and if I also ask you, ye will not answer me, nor let me go. Hereafter shall ye see *the Son of Man* sit on the right hand of the power of God." Jesus evidently alludes in his answer to the place in Daniel, ch. 7: 13. "I saw in the night-visions, and behold, one like the Son of Man came in the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." The Son of God is that Son of Man, and that Son of Man is the Son of God. He is called the Son of Man on account of his form and nature, and the Son of God on account of the divine favor shewn him in the high distinction which he obtains. In Matthew, ch. 16: 13, Jesus asked his disciples, "Whom do men say that I, *the Son of Man*, am?" And

---

21—24, ch. 5: 17, 18, ch. 6: 32, 33, 44—46, ch. 8: 29, 38, 40, 42, 47, 49, 54, ch. 16: 27—30, ch. 20: 17. The Lord's preference for this designation is expressive of the spirit of his revelation. He made the Deity known in his mercy and his love. The majesty and glory of God, as the Creator, the Sovereign, and the Judge, were known before; but in the richness of his grace he was revealed by Jesus Christ; and the Saviour designed to impress upon the believer's heart a deep and grateful sense of his paternal kindness by speaking of him as the Father, and using this as the common designation of him.

Peter says, "Thou (the Son of man) art the Christ, *the Son of the living God.*" The Son of man, therefore, is the Son of God; and this title belongs to him because he is the Christ, i. e. the anointed one, the king of Israel: the selection of him to this high dignity is the evidence that he is the Son of God, the favored and beloved one of God. In John, ch. 6: 27, Jesus says to the people who followed him, "Labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you; for him hath God the Father sealed." Here God is called the Father of the Son of Man: the Son of Man, as such, is therefore the Son of God.

It is worth our while to enquire here what Satan meant when he tempted Jesus to prove that he was the Son of God. He doubtless used the term in the sense in which the Jewish people understood it; and there is no reason to think that the sacred writers have used it in any other, when they apply it to Christ. See the history of the temptation in Matthew 4: 1—11.

If the tempter took Jesus to be a man, and understood the term, Son of God, to mean the favorite, the beloved one of God, all this history is plain and easy to be understood. Jesus having fasted forty days and forty nights, and being then oppressed with extreme hunger, seemed to be neglected and forgotten by the Deity, and very far from appearing like a beloved favorite. The tempter suggests to him, Convert these stones into bread. If thou be the beloved one of God, he cannot leave thee to suffer in this manner, and will assuredly give effect to thy command. So again when Jesus stood upon the pinnacle of the temple: "Cast thyself down," etc. If thou be the beloved one of God, he will take care of thee, and thou shalt receive no harm: the angels will, at his command, bear thee up in their hands, etc. The answers of Jesus also are predicated on the supposition that the Son of God is a man, who may hunger and must be sustained by the providence of God, like other men; and who like other men, is subject to the law, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." Man, he says, does not live by bread alone; therefore the Son of God does not, etc. Man must not tempt the Lord his God; therefore the Son of God must not tempt him, etc. But if the tempter understood the term Son of God to be a title of divinity, and to belong

to the divine nature of Christ, the whole history of the temptation is a mass of contradictions which it is impossible to make consistent. If the title Son of God was understood by the tempter to be a designation of divinity, then he doubted whether Jesus was God because he was hungry and destitute, and demanded that he should supply himself with bread by a miracle to prove his divinity!—He demanded that Jesus should prove himself divine by casting himself down from the pinnacle of the temple, alleging that, if he were God, then God, his Father, would command his angels to take care of his safety! The angels bearing up God in their hands, in his descent from the pinnacle, lest he should be hurt by the fall! And this too a proof that he is God! Or, if the tempter meant, If thou be the Son of God, according to another nature which is in thee, cast thyself down, etc.; how could the fact, that God the Father would preserve him by the ministry of angels, be a proof that he himself possessed a divine nature? It would prove that he was beloved and highly favored; but it could prove nothing more.

On the ground that the title Son of God belongs to the man Jesus Christ, and that it designates him as the object of the peculiar love of God, almost every text in the New Testament, where this title occurs, admits of an easy explanation. If a few remain where the meaning is obscure, and the reference of the title doubtful, they must submit to the established rule of hermeneutics, to receive their light from those which are clear. Let us examine some of the most striking texts of this class, or that seem to belong to it.

Heb. 1: 8—12. "But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever," etc.

This whole passage is represented by the sacred writer as addressed to the Son, in the Psalms from which its several parts are quoted. The first two verses, as we have already seen in another part of this discussion, describe him as a king among the kings of the earth, but pre-eminent above them. The last three, quoted from Ps. 102, where they are addressed to Jehovah, ascribe to him divine attributes, and make him the same Being whom the Jews worshipped as the eternal and immutable Creator of all things. What shall we say? Does this text make the *Sonship* of Jesus divine? Does it prove that the title Son of God is a

title of divinity? We are then reduced to this dilemma, that either the New Testament teaches two opposite doctrines on the same subject, or in all the numerous other places where the title occurs in a different sense, the obvious meaning of the words must be disregarded. But who will gravely contend for this? This text is situated precisely like that in Romans 9: 5, where Christ is said to be "God over all blessed for ever." In that place the learned Commentator will maintain that the term Christ is not a title of divinity, but a mere personal designation of the God-man, in which the proper import of the term, and the original ground of its application are neglected. But may we not say, It is equally so in this place with the title Son of God? It is a mere designation of the person who is both God and man, without regard to its import or the original ground of its application. If we take this ground, I am not aware that any answer can be given which will not be as good to prove that the term Christ is a divine title. Either both the one and the other is such a title, or neither of them is such. I will, however, not take exactly this ground. Throughout this chapter the term Son of God designates the man Jesus Christ, by whom God spoke to us, who purged away our sins with his own blood, and whom the Father has exalted as the one whom he loves and delights to honor; and now in this part of the chapter, as also in portions of v. 2 and 3, we are taught, that such a union subsists between this man and the Deity, that what is said of Jehovah in the Old Testament may be understood as being said of him. In his person the unseen Deity is made visible to men; God is manifested in the flesh. Hence he is called "the express image of God's person, and the brightness of his glory," i. e., his bright or splendid glory; and St. Paul says of him, "Who is the image of the invisible God;" Col. 1: 15; and Jesus himself, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father." John 14: 9.

Col. 1: 13—20. "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of *his dear Son*:" etc.

This text is similar in its character to the preceding one, in predicating of the same subject both human and divine attributes. It speaks of Jesus Christ and calls him God's dear Son. In him, it is said, we have redemption through

his blood; he is therefore the crucified Saviour. He is the image of the invisible God: consequently himself visible. He is the First-born, the most eminent, of every creature; therefore himself a creature. He is the beginning (of the resurrection), the first-born from the dead; consequently the man who expired upon the cross. And the fulness that dwells in him is one that results from the good pleasure of God. All this is predicated of the Son, and proves that the Son is the man Jesus Christ. At the same time he is described as the Being by whom all things were created, and by whom they consist. Does this prove that the Son, as such, is God? If as the Son he is God, he is not in the same respect man; if as the Son he is man, he cannot in the same respect be God. This title is here a personal designation of him who is both God and man; but still with reference to that nature to which it originally and properly belongs, that is, the human nature. Can any one prove the contrary?*

---

* Feeling some doubt of the entire correctness of our author's conclusions as to the *general* application of the title "Son of God," in the New Testament, we took the liberty to correspond with him and to make the following suggestions. 'Is it not the incarnate Logos, the God-man, the Mediatorial person, that is so named? I have no difficulty in admitting that the name, Son of God, was given in reference to his incarnation. *Son* he became by his incarnation. But this name once given, no matter on what ground, becomes descriptive of his whole person, of both natures and of either nature. So it appears to me to be employed; and so "Son of man" is employed, although this title was originally given in reference to the human origin of Messiah. The Messiah, (not the Logos,) is the Son of God in respect to his miraculous origin, and Son of man in respect to his human origin. But being once given these names appear to be used indiscriminately to designate the person of the Messiah, whether considered in respect to his divine or his human nature, or in respect to both.'

To these suggestions the learned author's reply is as follows, which he requests us to insert in further explanation of his views.

"Those who do not make the title, Son of God, a title of divinity, and consequently do not consider the Sonship of Christ a divine Sonship, generally, perhaps universally, understand this title as a designation of the compound person, the

Heb. 7: 3. The inspired author, speaking of Melchizedek, the king and priest of Salem, says of him, "Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; *but made like unto the Son of God,* he abideth a priest continually."

God-man, the incarnate Word. I admit that the title "Son of God" is sometimes a designation of the compound person, the God-man; but I connot be persuaded that it is always, or that it is generally so used: and when it is employed in this manner, it is always done with a reference to the human nature, the man Jesus Christ. If this title were always a designation of the compound person, the God-man, as such, and not used with reference to his human nature, it would follow that the God-man, as such, is inferior to the Father, could do nothing of himself, put up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears to him that was able to deliver him from death, learned obedience by the things which he suffered, knew not the day nor the hour of the judgment, etc. etc. But if these consequences must be admitted, they will prove that the divinity of Christ is not true divinity. Nothing is gained by distinguishing between the Logos incarnate and the Logos not incarnate. If the Logos be co-equal with the Father, he is always co-equal, whether incarnate or not. His union with the human nature could not change the nature of divinity, and the dignity of the compound person is therefore not less than the dignity of the Logos, which is the dignity of the Godhead. As the God-man, our Redeemer could not be subordinate to God, could not be exalted, could not in any sense be dependent. But as the Son of God, he is all this. Consequently the title Son of God is not properly a designation of the God-man, but of the man Jesus."

The discriminating reader will bear in mind that we do not maintain, in our suggestions above, that the title in question is "*always* a designation of the compound person, the God-man," but only that it appears to be used in the New Testament as a common name of the Messiah, whether spoken of in reference to his divine or his human nature, or in reference to both. We can not therefore agree with our author that when it is employed to designate the compound person, "it is always done with a reference to the human nature." This would lead to consequences, on the other hand, quite as absurd as our author has shewn to result from the exclusive use of the title to designate the compound person. EDITOR.

Here it seems, at first view, that the Son of God, as the Son, is without either beginning of days, or end of life, and consequently, as the Son, divine. But by this rule of interpretation he must also be without a father as well as without a mother; which would prove more than the theory we are opposing will admit. To find the sense of the place, let it be observed, that the subject of discussion here is not the *person* of Jesus Christ, but his *priesthood;* and the comparison with Melchizedek is therefore confined to this one point. Jesus Christ was constituted a high-priest after the order of Melchizedek, not after that of Aaron. His priesthood is therefore superior to the priesthood under the law, on two grounds: *first,* because Melchizedek was a greater man than Aaron: for even Abraham, the common father of the whole Israelitish nation, paid tithes to him, and received his blessing; *secondly* because the priesthood of Melchizedek, so far as it, appears at all, was an unchanging one. The Aaronitic priests were continually changed. Every one was the son of a father who had been the high-priest before him, and the father of a son who took the office after him; and none, therefore, continued long. But Melchizedek appears in the history without either parents or posterity; without a beginning of days, or end of life, to admit of succession in his priesthood; the first we learn of him is, that he is a priest of the Most High God; and the last we learn is that he is still the same priest. He is thus a type of the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who, in his glorified state, abides a priest for ever.

I have now considered all the texts which appear to me most worthy of notice in this controversy, and have shewn, I think, not only that Jesus himself gave no such explanation of the appellation Son of God as to make it a title of divinity, but that the New Testament contains none. Consequently the resurrection of Jesus, while it is admitted to be a public acknowledgment of God of the validity of all the claims which he had made, and of all the explanations which he had given, is no proof at all of his divinity; and consequently, no proof that the term Son of God is a designation of that divinity. We shall now be prepared for that interpretation of the text, at the head of this article, which we believe to be the true one.

I have already remarked,—(page 139) that the primary error of interpreters, from which all the rest necessarily fol-

low, consists in taking the terms *flesh* and *Spirit of holiness* to designate something in Christ himself, not something distinct from, and external to him. This error, as far as I know, is universal. The most usual and most approved interpretation makes the flesh the human nature of Christ. This obliges the interpreter to make the Spirit of holiness his divine nature. In so doing he violates the *usus loquendi*, and involves himself in the consequence, that Jesus is the Son of God according to his divinity, which is again contrary to the *usus loquendi;* and that he was proved to be divine by his resurrection, which is contrary to truth. In defending these positions, which he is thus compelled to take, the interpreter becomes embarrassed with new difficulties from which there is no escape.

The terms *flesh* and *Spirit of holiness* do not designate two constituents of the person of Christ, but two external agents that co-operated in making him what he is. The apostle's main thought in the text is not what Jesus Christ *is*, but how he was constituted and proved to be such as he is, namely, the Son of David and the Son of God. There were, in his conception, two distinct births, and two distinct agents that brought him to those births. The one birth was natural; it was from the mother's womb; by this he became the Son of David; and the agent that operated in it, and made him David's son, was the flesh, i. e. human nature or man; for after the miraculous conception, all the rest was natural. The other birth was supernatural; it was from the grave, in his resurrection from the dead; by this he was declared to be, the Son of God, i. e. God's chief-beloved; and the agent that wrought in it was not the flesh, not man, but the Holy Spirit of God.

This interpretation appears to me natural, easy, and clear. It gives a good sense; it violates no rule of exegesis, and creates no new difficulties that require to be solved; it is agreeable to the *usus loquendi*, harmonizes with the connection of the place, and accords with what is elsewhere taught concerning Christ. I have already shewn that the phrase *Spirit of holiness* means the Holy Spirit. There can be no question that the term *flesh* has the meaning of *human nature* or *man:* and if the Spirit of holiness be the Holy Spirit, or God, the flesh *must*, by the rule of antithesis, be human nature, or man. Neither can there be any doubt that the

terms *according to the flesh—according to the Spirit*, adapt themselves perfectly to our interpretation. The apostle's meaning is, Jesus Christ was constituted the Son of David, so far as the flesh operated ; and he was declared to be the Son of God, so far as the Holy Spirit was operative ; with this latter operation the flesh, or man, had nothing to do. According to the one he was born from the womb of Mary, who was a lineal descendant of David : according to the other he was brought forth from the grave, where he had lain among the dead. That St. Paul conceived the resurrection of Jesus in the similitude of a birth, appears from the place where he calls him "the first-born from the dead." Col. 1: 18. So likewise did the author of the Book of Revelation, ch. 1: 5. Enough has been said to shew the meaning of the term Son of God. That meaning is the only one that suits the connection of this place. The resurrection could not, in any way, prove Jesus to be God ; but it was a very satisfactory proof that he was the beloved of God. St. Paul has, however, a farther reference to the high dignity of Jesus as the Christ, the Messiah, the Prince and Saviour of the people of God ; and his meaning is, he was proved by his resurrection to be that beloved one of God who sustains this exalted office ; and, perhaps, after all, the term ἐν δυνάμει, *in, or with power*, may have reference to this dignity and dominion.

A similar antithesis of the flesh and the Spirit occurs in 1 Pet. 3: 18, where it is, however, obscured by a wrong translation. In the common English version the text reads thus ; "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us unto God. *being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit.*" In the Greek the clause which is here put in italics is, θανατωθεὶς μεν σαρκι, ζωοποιηθεὶς δε πνευματι. The nouns σαρκι and πνευματι are in the dative case of the agent after the passive participles θανατωθεὶς and ζωοποιηθεὶς. Both ought to have been rendered in the same way with the preposition *by ;* and the clause should read thus: *being put to death by the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit.* The translators were perfectly well acquainted with this rule of grammar, and were also sufficiently familiar with the rule of interpretation which requires that an antithesis in the original should be preserved in the translation ; but they were misled by what appeared to them the *exigentia*

loci. Having taken for granted that the term flesh designates the human nature of Christ, and the term Spirit his divine nature, they saw indeed that the latter clause might be translated, agreeably to the rule of grammar, *quickened by the Spirit;* but they could not see how the former could be rendered *put to death by the flesh;* for it would have been absurd, as well as false, to say that Christ was put to death by his own human nature. They preferred, therefore, though they must destroy the antithesis by it, to render the clause, "put to death *in* the flesh;" because it was true that Christ suffered in his human nature. But they could not now restore the antithesis by translating the second clause "quickened *in* the spirit;" for this would have involved the absurdity of supposing that the divine nature of Christ had died as well as the human; and that it was made alive, while the human nature was left in death. Here was an exigency indeed; but it arose out of their first error; and it should have caused them to suspect the truth of an opinion which they had taken for granted, rather than to violate both grammar and exegesis.

The respected brother before referred to has translated this clause so as to preserve the antithesis, but to destroy the sense. "Christ," says he, "is said to have been put to death *as to the flesh*, but to have remained alive *as to the Spirit*." He evidently took the Greek verb ζωοποιεομαι in a Hebraistic sense, supposing that like the Hebrew verb חָיָה which signifies both to live and to remain alive, it might be rendered in this way. It is true that Hebraisms are of frequent occurrence in the New Testament; but a Hebraism of this sort would hardly occur. The active form ζωοποιεω *to make alive, to quicken*, corresponds to the *Piel* or to the *Hiphil* conjugation of the Hebrew verb, but not to the *Kal*, in which alone that verb signifies *to live* and *to remain alive:* the passive form ζωοποιεομαι does not answer to either of those conjugations. This translation has been chosen to meet another *exigentia loci*, which, like the former, arose out of the error of taking the flesh for the human nature of Christ, and, while that erroneous interpretation was retained, could not be avoided. The proposed translation of this worthy brother is, however, a very unsatisfactory expedient to meet this exigency. It makes the apostle tell his readers that, when Christ was put to death

in his human nature, *he remained alive in his divine nature!* Could the apostle imagine that any one needed to be informed that the divine nature did not die with the man Jesus?—That the Godhead, the Creator and Preserver of the world, did not die when Jesus died? If he had thought them capable of such an absurdity, he must have felt that his whole epistle was very far above their capacity; and why then did he write to them in such a style?

The true interpretation of this text is given in the translation we have made above, *He was put to death by the flesh, but was quickened by the Spirit.* The term flesh does not designate the human nature of Christ, but man, mankind. In this sense the term *flesh* often occurs. David says, "I will not fear what flesh can do to me." Ps. 56: 4. Compare Jer. 17: 5, Dan. 2: 11, Matt. 24: 22. The flesh, that is, man put Jesus to death; but man did not revive him; this was done by the Holy Spirit of God; neither would the Holy Spirit suffer the effect of man's malignity to continue, but put an end to it, and took occasion from it to put the highest honor upon Jesus by quickening him in the grave and raising him up from among the dead. This interpretation is unconstrained, natural, easy, and in accordance with every rule of exegesis; and the sense which it elicits from the text is therefore, undoubtedly, the true sense; and so interpreted, it confirms the exposition we have given of the text at the head of this article.

I do not mean, in what I have said, that a noun in the dative case, construed with a passive verb, or its participle, is always the dative of the agent; it may always be so if the connection permit; and it must be so if the text does not yield a consistent sense without it, and this construction be therefore demanded by the connection.

Perhaps some person will object to me the manner in which the terms σαρκι, εν σαρκι, and κατα ανθρωπους σαρκι opposed to κατα θεον πνευματι, occur in the passage 1 Peter 4: 1—6. I admit that in all these examples σαρκι and ἐν σαρκι may be rightly translated *in the flesh;* but I see nothing in them that militates against the preceding argument; inasmuch as the connection does not require that we should take them as the dative of the agent. The phrase *in the flesh*, that is, *in the body*, means in the present life or state of being, as distinguished from the future state, which is out of the flesh.

As it would carry me too far, were I to undertake a minute examination of this text, I shall only give what I take to be its meaning in the following paraphrase.

Forasmuch as Christ hath suffered for us, being in the flesh, arm yourselves also with the same mind, being ready, while you live, to suffer for his sake, whatever men may inflict upon you, were it even a violent death like his. All the suffering of which men can be the cause, is limited to the present state of being, and cannot reach beyond it to the future world: as it cannot now affect Christ, so it cannot then affect you. And this suffering, so far from doing you any real harm, will be of great service to you in subduing the sinful propensities of the body: for he that hath thus suffered in the flesh, (εν σαρκι,) hath ceased from sin, in such a sense that he does not, henceforth, live the rest of the time, during which he continues in the flesh (εν σαρκι,) in obedience to the lusts of men, but in obedience to the will of God. For the time of our life which is past is enough for us to have done the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries: in which things they think it strange that ye run not with them into the same excess of riot, speaking evil of you. They, as well as others, are the persons who shall give account of their deeds to him who is ready to judge the quick and the dead; not confining his judgment to the living, but extending it to the whole race of men, whether they be living or dead. For it is to this end that the gospel was preached to those of our brethren also who are now dead, and for that reason seem to the infidel to have nothing farther to hope for from the promise of Christ's coming, that, inasmuch as, agreeably to the plan of the gospel, the body indeed is condemned to death, because of the sin which adheres to it: but the spirit is appointed to life, because of the righteousness which is formed in it, (Rom. 8: 10,) so they may be condemned indeed in the flesh (σαρκι) in the view of men (κατα ανθρωπους) who cannot see beyond the visible flesh in this life, but may live in the spirit, in the spiritual nature of body and soul, (πνευματι) in the view of God, (κατα θεον) who sees what is beyond this present state of being. Their faith in the gospel did not, indeed, save them from that condemnation which is come upon all mankind by the first sin, nor, perhaps, from a premature and

violent death, which men think the lot of those only whom the Deity disapproves; but it has secured to them an eternal life in heaven; and while in the judgment of men they are condemned, in the judgment of God they are happy.

ARTICLE VII.

Remarks on "An Essay on Cause and Effect, in connection with Fatalism and Free Agency:" Am. Bib. Repos., Oct., 1839. Vol. II. p. 381. seq.

By Rev. Leonard Woods, D. D, Prof. of Theol. in the Theol. Sem., Andover, Mass.

To the Editor of the American Biblical Repository,

Dear Sir,—I have read with no ordinary interest, the Essay in the last number of the Repository "on Cause and Effect in connection with the Doctrines of Fatalism and Free Agency." I have read it again and again, and have bestowed no small attention on every part of it. The name of the writer is withheld, you say, on account of very peculiar circumstances. As there are no such circumstances in my case, I shall offer remarks on the Essay in my own name.—The writer of the Essay may be one, for whom I entertain a very sincere esteem and affection. I choose to think that he is so; and it will be altogether most agreeable to my feelings to proceed in my remarks with the apprehension distinctly in my mind, that the anonymous author of the Essay, who has given such evidence of ability to write well, possesses also a sincere love of the truth, a full conviction of the narrow limits of human intelligence, humility, candor, reverence for the Scriptures, and every other quality which belongs to the Christian character. Such an apprehension may have a salutary influence upon what I am to write. It will, at least, render my employment in writing very pleasant.

After all, *my concern will be exclusively with the subject.* And while I shall take the liberty to call in question some

of the principal positions which I find in the Essay, it will be my endeavor to guard scrupulously against every thing which would be unjust or disrespectful to the author. Indeed I shall refer to the Essay chiefly as an occasion of introducing several topics, which seem to require special attention at the present day.

The subject under consideration, it will be perceived, is of a philosophical or metaphysical nature, and the following remarks are intended for those, who have a capacity for metaphysical enquiries, and who have so far attended to matters of this kind, that they are prepared to begin where the present discussion begins, without any pains on my part to prove or explain the common and established principles of mental science.

Considering the nature of the topics introduced in this Essay, I should hardly deem it proper to busy myself in preparing remarks upon them, were it not that they have a bearing upon some very important principles of revelation. The manner in which we regard those principles will unavoidably be affected by the views we take of the general subject presented before us by this ingenious, but anonymous writer.

Let me say, however, that *our mode of thinking on this subject cannot alter the facts in the case.* If all the men and all the women in the world should happen to think, that our being *uniformly* influenced in our volitions by motives, and our choosing *invariably* according to the *strongest* motive, is inconsistent with free moral agency, it would not make it inconsistent. Should they be ever so confident, that moral necessity, as explained by Edwards, Day, Abercrombie, and others, is the same as Fatalism; still it would not make it so. If it is a law of our nature, that our volitions invariably follow that which is, on the whole, the strongest motive; then whether we admit or deny this in our speculations, this law will stand and we shall conform to it in practice; and, in all respects, we shall proceed to choose and act under the influence of the strongest motive, without the least infringement of our rational or moral freedom. The writer of the Essay, I cannot but think, does himself really act on this principle, though against his speculative theory. There were reasons, I suppose, for and against his publishing an Essay on this subject; and probably he will find, on reflection, that these reasons were very carefully weighed, and that,

in a mind like his, the most important reasons finally prevailed. So also there were, doubtless, reasons for and against his giving his name to the public. But the special reasons which he had against it, were unquestionably the most weighty in his mind; otherwise I should not know how to account for it, that he deliberately chose concealment. And who can doubt, that in all important cases which shall occur hereafter, he will thus deliberate, thus weigh the reasons for different determinations, and decide according to that which is, in his view, the strongest. And I am greatly mistaken, if he ever finds, that choosing and acting invariably according to this principle, interferes at all with his free agency, though his theory, as set forth in some parts of the Essay, might lead him to think that it would. The same is true of all other men. Rational beings will choose and act according to the laws of their intelligent and moral nature, whatever speculative theories they may form in their waking or sleeping hours. The laws of the mind are too firmly established to be shaken by our notions.

I am gratified that the author of this Essay, and some other late writers, make a distinction between *desire* and *volition*. It is a source of no small confusion in Edward's Treatise on the Will, that he uses the word in so wide a sense and considers all the *affections* and *desires* as acts of the *will*. It is, however, manifest that Edwards himself departs from this large sense of the word, and brings out the distinction which is now contended for, whenever he speaks of the desires or affections of the mind as among *the motives to volition*. Surely the *motive* to volition, and *volition* itself, cannot be the same thing.

I am gratified also, that the writer says distinctly, what Locke and others have been careful to say before, that "the Will is not a separate existence, to which qualities and actions can be ascribed. It is the mind itself which is excited and which is moved by desire or motive, and the Will is the power which the mind has to choose which of several co-existing desires shall be gratified."

I proceed now to the main point. The writer says (p. 386), "The point at issue is simply this: *Is volition connected with a previous desire or motive as a producing constitutional cause?*" The affirmative he thinks is *Fatalism*; the negative, the doctrine of *Free Agency*.

The writer takes commendable care to inform us very definitely, what he means by a "producing cause," and how we are to discover its existence. He maintains, (p. 388) that according to the doctrine of free agency, "there is *no invariable* rule of volition,"—"no *fixed* connection between any class of desires and volition, that "desires or motives are only the *occasional* causes, which enable the mind to exercise its inherent power of action, itself being the producing cause of its own volitions." He says too, (p. 388), "The only method of proving any thing to be a producing cause is to show, that, in given circumstances, there is an *invariable rule* of change, so that when a cause is put in these circumstances, a certain change *invariably* follows. It is the *unfailing constancy* of the result, that enables us to detect the real producing cause. The philosopher, in experimenting to detect causes, is continually seeking to learn *which one* of the various circumstances cannot have a substitute,—*which* must be invariably an antecedent." He says the same, p. 389. "The only method of proving a thing to be a *producing* cause, is to establish the fact that it is an *invariable* antecedent."

Our author makes his meaning still more evident by his quotations from Priestly, and the use he makes of them. (p. 389, 390). Priestly says in common with Edwards, and a multitude of distinguished writers; "There is some fixed law respecting the Will;—it is never determined without some motive of choice; and motives influence us in *some definite and invariable manner*, so that volition or choice is constantly regulated by what precedes it. And this *constant* determination of the mind, according to the motive presented to it, is all I mean by *necessary* determination." He holds that, *through all nature, the same consequences invariably result from the same circumstances.*" Now our author says, "no intelligent defender of free agency will admit this." And his object in quoting it is to show what he means by Fatalism. If we assert, that volition is invariably preceded by the strongest motive or by that which, at the moment of choice, "seems most agreeable," he says we are Fatalists.

To this allegation of the author I now invite the reader's particular attention.

I cannot but notice, that the author seems here and there to give an incorrect statement of the question at issue. He

represents the doctrine of moral or philosophical necessity as implying, that "there is a *particular kind* of motive which is the invariable antecedent of volition." He says: "every one allows that motives of *some sort* are invariably antecedents to volition. This is taken for granted; and then the admission is used as if it were conceded that a *particular kind* of motive were the invariable antecedent. As if a man should claim that *sowing of some sort* is always an antecedent to all kinds of harvest, and when this is allowed, should assume that the sowing of *wheat* is the invariable antecedent of all kinds of harvest." If the author can show, that Edwards or any other respectable writer has ever maintained such an opinion, or reasoned in such a manner, it will be truly surprising to me. For it would seem that no one could believe what is so obviously contrary to experience, as this, that volition uniformly follows *a particular kind* of motives. One particular *kind* of motives consists of those which are derived from the appetite of hunger and thirst; another kind, of those derived from the sense of hearing; another, from the sense of seeing; another from a regard to property; another, from the love of promotion or praise; another, from love to God. The *particular kinds* of motives are past numbering. Now who ever entertained the idea, that our volitions are all influenced by a *particular kind* of motives? It is really as unnecessary for the author to disprove this, as to disprove the other thing he mentions, namely, that *sowing wheat* will produce all kinds of harvest.

The author speaks as though *a particular kind* of motive and the *strongest* motive were one and the same thing. He says, (p. 396) "as if it were conceded that a particular kind of motive (i. e. the strongest) were the invariable antecedent." But the strongest motive is sometimes of one kind, and sometimes of another. To one man the love of honor is the strongest motive; to another man, the love of wealth, to another the love of Christ. In many cases, various kinds of motives are combined to make the strongest. Now it is matter of wonder to me, that the author should think that he is opposing a position which any one has maintained, when he affirms again and again, "that there is no particular class of motives which are invariable antecedents to volition," and that we have power to choose and do choose

sometimes in one way, and sometimes in another way; that is, sometimes according to one class of motives, sometimes according to another. Nothing is more certain, than that we do choose in these different ways. And why? Is it not because sometimes one particular class of motives is the strongest, and sometimes another class?

The author says, (p. 38[illegible]). "The point at issue is simply this: s volition connected with a previous desire (or motive) as a producing cause?"—which seems to imply that *d sire* and *motive* are words of equal import, or that all motive consists of desire. The p int at issue I think might more properly be stated thus: whether volition is connected with a previous desire, *or any thing else which has the nature of a motive*, as its invariable antecedent or cause.

Again, The author seems to suppose that the asserters of moral necessity hold, that all the changes in the mind are caused by something ab extra; and, in opposition to this notion, refers to the eternal mind, which before creation acted without any ab extra cause (p. 3[illegible]5). But the doctrine of Edwards and others agreeing with him, is not that the changes or acts of the mind result wholly from causes extraneous to the mind. By motive Edwards means "the whole of that which moves, excites, or invites the mind to volition;" including not only "the views of the mind, but the state, frame, temper, or habit of the mind." These do indeed, generally at least, refer to things without the mind. But mental acts are prompted mainly and ultimately by what is within the mind. An apostle teaches that a man is tempted and drawn into sin by his own unholy *desire*, (James 1: 14, 15). And is not affection to Christ and a desire to please him the great motive to obedience with every believer? And how can we form any other conception of God, than that he chooses and acts from his own perfections; that, before any thing else existed, he had a reason or motive for his determinations and actions in the unbounded wisdom, righteousness, and goodness of his own nature. No one can doubt that the mind itself is, in the strictest sense, an agent; that it has inherent powers of action; and that it really exerts its powers in a great variety of volitions and other exercises; and that the grand ultimate motive, by which it is influenced to all these is *within itself;* that is, its own dispositions, desires, habits, etc. It will be

worth the while to remember that we all hold to this, so that it is unnecessary *to spend time* to prove it.

I might notice other passages in which our author seems to misapprehend the opinions which he undertakes to controvert. But it is time to proceed to the consideration of the prominent principle of the Essay.

Here I propose particularly to inquire how far the author contributes to overturn his own system. For whatever he does towards this result will prevent the necessity of labor on my part.

The author expressly admits "that mind never will choose, except to gain some good;" "that motives of *some kind* are indispensable antecedents of volition;" that "every one allows that motives of *some sort* are *invariably* antecedents to volition." Here then is one of the laws of our intelligent nature. *Motives of some sort are invariable and indispensable antecedents to volition.* This is a point in which we are all agreed. Volition cannot take place without a motive. How great soever the inherent power of the mind, and how various soever the acts of which it is capable; here is a manifest *limitation* of its power. A man has no power to put forth a volition without a motive. To choose in this way would be contrary to the constitution and nature of the mind. Though our author says in some parts of his Essay that "there is *no invariable* rule of volition;" he could not but see, that there is, at least, *this one* invariable rule; and seeing it, he frankly acknowledged it. Now does he, or any other candid person, complain of *this invariable rule* of volition? Does he complain that the mind is tied up to this constitutional principle,—that it must, in all its choices be influenced by motives? He does not complain. But what follows from the admission of this principle? It follows that motive, motive of some sort, is what he calls "the *producing cause* of volition." For he says again and again, that "the only method of proving a thing to be a producing cause, is to establish the fact, that it is an *invariable antecedent.*" Here we have an invariable antecedent, that is, *motive;* not *one particular class* of motives, but *motive of some kind.* And motive of some kind, being the invariable antecedent, is, according to the author's own showing, "the producing cause of volition." And such a cause he considers incompatible with free agency. Is it

then so soon come to this, that our author, with all his dislike to Fatalism, is according to his own account of the matter, a Fatalist?

Farther. Our author, it seems, has no fear that free agency will be destroyed or impeded by being confined to this invariable rule, namely, that volition must always have a motive of some sort. He holds that a free agent is placed under this invariable influence of motive; that without motive he cannot put forth a volition, -not merely that he cannot have a volition in this or that particular way, but that he cannot have it in any way; that his will cannot act at all, any more than if it were struck dead. Such is the principle the author admits. And if there is any one who doubts the truth of this principle, let him look carefully into his own mind, and determine for himself by a fair trial, *whether he can put forth a volition without any reason or motive.* Surely any man of sense can succeed in this, if the thing is practicable. If he fails of being satisfied with one trial, let him proceed to a second, and though the effort may possibly put his mind into a very odd condition, and may occasion something of an unpleasant distortion; let him persevere, till he clearly finds out, whether his rational, moral nature is really tied to the principle above mentioned, namely, *that motive is, and must be an invariable antecedent of volition.*

But the connection of volition with the *strongest* motive,—*this* is regarded by the author as destructive of free agency. That we are governed in our volitions by motives of some kind, and of some degree of strength, is admitted as a fact, and as perfectly safe for us as free agents. But to be governed invariably by the *strongest* motive,—this is looked upon as *Fatalism.* I confess it is difficult for me to account for this view of the subject; and I am quite inclined to have a little free conversation with the respected, but nameless author. Permit me then to ask; why do you object to being *invariably* influenced in your volitions by that which is, on the whole, the *strongest* motive, while you are willing to be influenced by motives of some kind? Can you think it a privilege to be influenced by a *weaker*, rather than a *stronger* motive? to be governed in your voluntary actions by reasons of *less* weight, those which *appear* to you of less weight, rather than by those which are, or appear to be

of greater weight? Or would it be a better law of the mind, that we should study variety in this matter, and should sometimes choose according to what we consider the strongest motive or the most powerful reason,—sometimes, according to what we consider a weaker motive; and sometimes, for the sake of variety, and to display our unshackled inherent power, according to what really appears to us the weakest motive of all?—When you wish, in any case, to know what to choose, would you think it proper to deliberate, at one time, in order to ascertain what is the strongest reason or motive, so that you might choose according to that; at another time, to hit upon a reason or motive of inferior force, so that you might choose according to that; and at another time, to get at a reason or motive the weakest of all, that you might evince your unfettered freedom by choosing according to that? Can you recollect any instance in your past life, in which you did really choose and act in accordance with a motive which appeared to you to be, on the whole, of less weight, than another motive which you rejected? And if any one should presume to charge you with acting on this principle, and with habitually preferring what you regarded as a less reason or motive to what you regarded as a greater; would you not look at him with astonishment, and ask him, whether he really thought that a rational being could act so preposterously? Or if it should in fact be found, that you have a habit of acting, occasionally at least, in this way, methinks your friends would be very much perplexed. For if at any time they would induce you to determine upon a particular course, how would they know, whether they could best succeed by urging the strongest reason, or the weakest?

After all perhaps it is not the particular object of the author to maintain, that any man does actually reject what seems to him, on the whole, the strongest reason, and actually choose according to what he regards as the weaker reason; but that a free agent has *power* to do so. It may possibly appear, on careful inquiry, that there is much less difference in the *ideas* of men on this point, than in their *words*. Without stopping however, to examine this, I would inquire, whether the author is certain, that it is not a law of our rational nature, that we should choose and act in accordance with what appears to us the highest reason, or the

strongest motive? If it should at last become evident, that this *is* a law of our rational nature; then a power to choose and act contrary to this, would be a power to subvert the very constitution of the mind, and to divest ourselves of our rationality. Can any one think that we have such a power; or that such a power, if it could exist, would be desirable? In my judgment, the constitution or law of the mind, for which Edwards contends, is only that constitution or law, which makes us *rational beings*, and makes us so *permanently*.

But to proceed with the point before us, although the author holds that the strongest motive cannot be the antecedent of volition invariably without destroying free agency; he allows that it may be so *occasionally*. There are many passages in the Essay which plainly imply that, in the author's opinion, a free agent may choose *once*, and *again*, yea very *frequently*, according to the strongest motive. All that he denies is, that we can do it *constantly*, and yet be free. But if we can choose once, and twice, and frequently in this way, consistently with free agency, it proves clearly, that there is nothing in the *nature of such a choice*, which interferes with our freedom. If there were any thing in the *nature* and *circumstances* of such a choice inconsistent with free agency; then we could never, in *any* instance choose in this way, without setting aside our freedom. And, what would seem very strange, we should according to this, be obliged, in order to be free, to choose always according to the *weaker* motive; that is, the *weaker* motive must be the invariable antecedent of volition. But I suppose that the author would think, such an invariable antecedent as this would interfere with freedom as much as any other. He insists that there can be *no* invariable antecedent of volition consistently with freedom; that volition must sometimes follow motives of one kind, and one degree of strength, and sometimes of another kind, and another degree of strength. Certainly then it may sometimes, yea, frequently, follow the strongest motive. Indeed, according to the author's opinion, following the strongest motive *ever so often*, will not hurt our free agency, unless we do it *invariably*. Now I ask the question, and wish it may be fairly answered: If our choosing according to the strongest motive to-day and to-morrow will not take away our freedom; why should it take away our freedom to choose in this way the next day and the next following?

If we may, consistently with our free agency, choose according to the strongest motive, two-thirds or three-fourths of the time, what is there inconsistent with free agency, in choosing in exactly the same way the rest of the time? If a part, even the greater part of our volitions may consistently be put forth in this manner; why not all of them? Will the author look into this matter with some special care?

But I have a little more to suggest on this point. Suppose that a free moral agent is completely in a right state of mind; that he judges correctly respecting all the objects of affection; that his desires in every case correspond with the truth, and that he forms a just estimate of the comparative weight of the motives presented before him. Such a man, the author expressly declares, will uniformly govern his choice by the strongest motive. He says (p. 394) that, "in all cases where the strongest desire coincides with the decisions of the judgment,—the mind chooses to gratify the strongest desire." That is, in all cases where the disposition and habits are right, a moral agent chooses in conformity with the strongest desire or motive. The strongest motive, in all such cases, is the invariable antecedent of volition. But this *invariable antecedence* is a fearful thing, and is proof of a "producing cause;" and a "producing cause" overthrows free agency, and constitutes Fatalism. Now as Jesus Christ was perfectly holy;—as his strongest desire always coincided with the decisions of judgment; he always chose according to the strongest motive. Here, then, was that invariable antecedence of the strongest motive, "that invariable rule of volition," which is proof of a producing cause; and a producing cause takes away freedom. If, then, the scheme of the author is true, our Saviour was not a free agent, but acted under the influence of Fatalism. And as all the angels in heaven conform to this rule, *they*, too, are all destitute of freedom. And inasmuch as Christians in this life conform to the same rule in proportion as they are holy; in the same proportion must their free agency be impaired. And when they become perfectly holy, they will invariably choose according to the strongest motive, and of course will lose all their freedom.

Such is the author's theory; and such the assistance which he very candidly affords us in exposing it. If the theory were true, what an alarming influence it would have!

See to what an extent it would sweep away the free agency of free agents! As the strongest desire or motive is the invariable antecedent of volition with all perfectly holy beings, and as this cannot consist with free agency; Christ, and the innumerable multitude of angels, and the spirits of just men made perfect, are all entirely destitute of freedom. Christians are all so in a degree, and will be so wholly by and by. Moreover, as the author allows that *all* men *sometimes* choose according to the strongest motive; how can he avoid the conclusion that, so far as they do this, they are all deprived of free agency? And he farther says, that with *all* men motive of some sort is the invariable antecedent of volition; which invariable antecedence of motive is proof of a producing cause, and this sets aside free agency. Where then, in heaven or earth shall we look for free moral agents? Or if any remain, we see how easy it is for them to rid themselves of their freedom, by becoming holy, that is, by bringing their desires to coincide with the decisions of judgment, so that they may constantly choose and act according to the strongest motive.

The *consequences* of adopting the theory of moral agency set forth in the Essay, are fearful, in proportion to the importance of the principles which it tends to undermine.

The theory implies, that a free moral agent must be free not only from force or coercion, but also from any *invariable rule of action*. It assumes that the invariable antecedence of the strongest desire or motive to volition is irreconcileable with free agency. If we are influenced in our volitions in this invariable manner,—if the choices, which the mind, as the agent, makes, are constantly dependent on antecedent causes; it follows, as the author of the Essay thinks, that those antecedent causes are "producing" efficient causes, and that our choosing according to them is a law of our nature, fixed by the Creator; and of course, that we have no power to put forth volitions in a different manner, as this would be contrary to a law of our nature. And if we have no power to choose and act differently, we are under a necessity of choosing and acting as we do; and this he says is Fatalism, and precludes accountableness. This I suppose is the course of thought with all who adopt the principle of *contingent volition*, as commonly understood. This principle has been sufficiently examined by Edwards, Day, and others.

It is manifest, that this principle of contingent volition is the basis of the philosophical theory of moral agency which is adopted by numbers at the present day, and substantially by our author. And see what a sweeping influence it has in his mind in regard to our emotions, desires, etc. These, he says, result from "constitutional producing causes." "It is God who, by the constitution of the mind and the ordering of his providence, decides what desires shall exist." We cannot prevent them. The objects which awaken desire, are the causes of desire in such a sense, "that no other effect could follow without a change in the nature of things." Of course, the author regards our desires, emotions, etc., as in themselves, no part of free accountable agency. According to the principle of the Essay, (p. 399, 400,) all those affections, emotions and desires, which arise spontaneously in the mind in view of their appropriate objects, are excluded from the supervision of the moral law. For how can they belong to the catalogue of moral exercises, when they arise in the mind *invariably* in view of their proper objects, and do not wait for the bidding of the will?

On this notion respecting our emotions and desires, which obviously results from the principles of the Essay, and which the author expressly maintains, I have a few remarks to offer.

My first and most important remark is, that *it stands in direct and palpable opposition to the authority of God's word.* His law requires *love*, and forbids all those emotions and desires which are contrary to love. Love is doubtless an affection or emotion of the mind; and doubtless it arises in view of suitable objects; and, if the heart is right, arises *invariably*, when those objects are presented before it. Nothing is necessary to excite love in a holy mind but the sight of a holy object. And is not love to God a *holy* emotion? The desire of the heart for God, for holiness, and for heaven,—is it not a *holy* desire? And does it not arise spontaneously in the mind of a holy being, when those objects are presented to his view? Even when the objects are brought before him without any previous design or thought of his, are not the same emotions excited? Take also a moral agent of another character. Take a man who is unregenerate, and who has that carnal mind which is enmity against God. When such a one turns his attention

to God, and sees him in any measure as he is; does not the feeling of dissatisfaction and enmity spontaneously arise? While he remains in his natural state, can he, by the power of his will, prevent it, and call forth the affection of love, and so be subject to the law of God? How is it with pride, anger, envy, revenge, covetousness, impure desire, and other affections, which, as Christ informs us, come forth from the heart? In a state of unregeneracy does not one or the other of these arise spontaneously in the mind, just as the disposition happens to be, when the appropriate object is presented to view? Is not this the case with the *moral* affections, as much as with the *natural?* If I rightly understand the author, he would admit all the facts here mentioned. But does not his theory imply that they are no part of moral agency? As unrenewed men *invariably* have wrong affections and desires, and as perfectly holy beings *invariably* have right affections and desires, in view of moral objects, these right and wrong affections and desires must all be excluded from the catalogue of *moral* exercises. Such is the obvious principle of the Essay, and does it not directly contradict the word of God? If there is any thing which the moral, spiritual precepts of the divine law undertake to control, it is the *affections* and *desires* of *the heart.* What is the love required by the two comprehensive precepts of the moral law, but an *affection* of the heart? What is hungering and thisting after righteousness, but *desire?* The Greek επιθυμεω, επιθυμια, generally translated *desire*, denote both good affection and desire, and bad. When it denotes bad desire, it is often translated by *lust.* And who needs to be told that Christ and the Apostles speak of the affections and desires, and the passions too, (παθη, Rom. 1: 26, 1 Thess. 4: 5,) as belonging to moral character? These are the inner man, upon which the eye of God is specially fixed. The theory which would free us from responsibility in regard to these, or would represent them as not in their own nature morally good or evil—who can reconcile it with the current language of the New Testament? How could Christ and the Apostles have spoken as they did, if they had entertained such an opinion, as is expressed in the Essay?

Secondly. The theory above described is contrary to *the dictates of conscience.* Every man, not blinded by pre-

judice, disapproves of his disorderly affections and desires, and condemns himself on account of them. He is conscious that it is sinful to *gratify* them. But why should it be sinful to *gratify* desires which are *not* sinful? It is a common sentiment, that the sinfulness of men is great, in proportion as their passions and desires are awakened suddenly and uncontrollably in view of forbidden objects. Suppose any one is instantly filled with revengeful feeling at the thought of his enemy, or with envy at the thought of his superior, or with covetous desire at the thought of money, or with pride and vanity at the thought of himself; and suppose these feelings rise to such strength and violence, that he finds it exceedingly difficult to check them. Is not *he* the man that we look upon, as uncommonly depraved and wicked?

And if the theory is opposed to the consciences of men generally, it is more decidedly opposed to the *spiritual experience and consciousness of the devoted Christian.* He knows that he is holy or unholy in the sight of God, according to the nature of the emotions and desires which are awakened within him, in view of moral objects. And if any scheme of philosophy contradicts this sentiment, he knows it to be wrong. If he finds that his state of mind is such, that the contemplation of worldly pleasure, wealth, and honor instantly kindle within him what the Apostle calls the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life;—especially if he finds, that these desires are *unawares* burning within him; he concludes that his heart is indeed very corrupt, yea, desperately wicked, and he learns how important it is, that such an one as he should fly from temptation, and should watchfully guard against every thing which would bring any tempting object before him. And the more spiritual a Christian is, the more quick is he to discern and to condemn the first motions of the sin that dwells in him,—the first and feeblest actings of unholy affection or desire. Tell him your philosophy teaches, that he is not culpable for unsought, unlooked for emotions of pride, envy, covetousness, revenge, or impurity: his deep consciousness replies, that your philosophy is false. He sees and knows, that these emotions, in whatever way excited, are, in themselves, morally wrong, and contrary to that spiritual law, which extends its authority over all the thoughts and feelings of his

heart. In view of his inward pollutions, he exclaims; *Behold, I am vile!* and his earnest prayer is, that his heart may be cleansed by the grace of God.

Thirdly. The theory advanced in the Essay is contrary to *the principles of philosophy*, even those principles which seem to be implied in the Essay. The author mentions it as a point of essential importance in his theory, "that the mind alone is the real producing cause of its own volitions." By this I suppose it is meant, that the mind itself *acts* in willing, and that the volition is *wholly* the mind's act; that the mind is the agent, and the only agent that puts forth its volitions. If any thing different from this is meant, I have not been told what it is. The author says, "all sin arises from that power of free agency, which makes the mind the sole producing cause of its own volitions." And holiness, he doubtless believes, arises from the same cause. Now does not the power of free agency equally make the mind the producing cause of its own *emotions*, *affections*, and *desires?* Is not the mind as *really active* in these, as in its volitions? Is it not as *intensely* active? Are not affections and desires mental actions of as high an order as volitions? In what can the rational and moral faculties be more truly or more intensely active, than in loving God with all the heart and soul and mind and strength? And as to the hungering and thirsting after righteousness spoken of by our Saviour,—is it not truly an *act* of the mind? And is not the mind as much the *author* or *cause* of it, as of any other mental act? Does not every Christian speak of it as his own act, when he says, "*I love* the Lord." "Thou knowest that *I love* thee." Is it not therefore evident, even according to the principles of the Essay, that affection and desire are as truly of a moral nature, as volition? And it may, I think, be satisfactorily shown, that volition itself, in the most important instances, derives its moral nature from those affections and desires of the heart which prompt it, and is universally regarded as good or bad, according to the goodness or badness of those affections or desires.

I would remark here, that the doctrine of the Essay in regard to our emotions and desires is widely different from that which has been held by the great body of learned Divines and Philosophers. Even those who insist that all morality is comprised in the acts of the *will*, are far from

excluding the affections and desires; for by giving a larger sense to the word, *will*, they include the affections and desires among its acts.

Is it said, as in the Essay, for the purpose of showing that we are not answerable for our desires,—"that it is God, who, by the constitution of the mind and the ordering of his providence, decides what desires shall exist?" And does he not in the same way decide what *volitions* shall exist? The author ascribes to God "the power to prevent any given volition, by removing an object of desire, or by substituting some other in its place." He holds that no volitions can take place without motives, and that all motives are under the ordering of God's providence. And it is clearly implied in the Essay, that the influence of motives is made absolutely necessary by the constitution of the mind. Now if all this agency and control of God over *volitions* does not interfere with their moral nature, nor hinder us from exercising free agency in them; why should we suppose that the same divine agency prevents our free agency in the exercise of *affection* and *desire?*

An appeal is often made in the Essay to the consciousness of men. I join in this appeal. If a man has in his heart an emotion of love to his fellow-creatures, and a real desire for their good; is he not conscious that it is *right?* Or if the emotion of hatred, envy, or revenge rises in his heart; is he not conscious that the emotion is wrong? Does he not disapprove of it as really, as he does of a definite, formal purpose to injure others, or even for an injurious act? And does not the explanation which our Saviour gives of the moral law, Matth. 5: 27, 28, 43, 44, entirely correspond with these remarks?

And yet, according to the principles advanced in some parts of the Essay, the emotions and desires of the heart are not to be regarded as possessing a moral nature, or as appertaining to moral character. And why? According to the Essay the answer I suppose must be, that *they certainly and invariably rise in the mind, when fit objects are presented to view.* He holds, as I understand him, that this circumstance shows that our desires are not free, moral, accountable acts of the mind. But he gives no proof. I maintain that this circumstance does not show this, and that the theory of the author on this subject is wide of the truth. I allege, and have

endeavored to show, that the theory is not only destitute of proof, but is opposed to the true sense of the moral law, which reaches to the desires and feelings of the heart; that it is opposed to the consciousness of men, especially of good men; and that it is opposed to the principles of philosophy, even those contained in the Essay.

Again. It is the common doctrine of evangelical ministers and Christians, that there is a certain, invariable connection between the apostacy of Adam and the sinfulness of all his posterity; that *his* sin is the invariable antecedent of their sinful disposition, their sinful volitions, and their sinful conduct; that it is the divine constitution and the invariable law of our nature, that every one who is born of human parents, will be a sinner. It is the general belief that, according to the Scriptures and according to facts, this law is as *invariable*, as any law of the physical creation. Now according to the theory of the Essay, this "invariable antecedence," is proof of a *producing cause;* and the existence of such a producing cause excludes free agency. According to this theory, therefore, one of these two things must be true; either that the common orthodox doctrine is true, and that native depravity, and all our sinful volitions and actions, as the invariable consequence of Adam's sin, is a matter of Fatalism, entirely precluding free, accountable agency; or else that there is no such invariable connection between Adam's sin and the sin and condemnation of his posterity, and that the doctrine, universally held by evangelical Christians, and taught by Paul, is not true.

And what would become of the doctrine of *election and efficacious grace* under the operation of this theory? The doctrine as commonly understood, implies, that the repentance of all who are saved, invariably follows the purpose of God, and that special influence of the Spirit which is given to carry the divine purpose into effect. Now the author cannot, consistently with his theory, admit that the repentance and faith of sinners certainly and invariably follow this divine purpose and influence; because the invariableness of such an antecedent cause would preclude the free agency of those brought under its influence. The agency of men in repenting, believing and obeying, cannot, according to this theory, be free agency, if it is the certain, invariable effect of the special purpose and agency of God. And to

secure to men their freedom in this concern, the author, to be consistent, must hold, that there is no invariable connection between this divine cause, and the repentance of sinners, and that it is impossible for God to exert such an influence upon those who are chosen to salvation, as will certainly and invariably bring them to repentance, without violating their free agency; and then he must hold that, to guard their freedom from infringement, their conversion must be left uncertain, so that it may follow the special purpose and agency of God, or not, as their sovereign will shall decide.

The same as to the doctrine of *perseverance.* If God should exert such an influence upon the regenerate, as invariably to secure their perseverance in holiness; then according to the theory of the author, they would loose their free agency. Accordingly, every one who embraces the theory and is consistent, must take care not to ascribe to God an influence which *certainly* and *invariably* causes perseverance, and must not *pray* for such an influence, as it would take away free agency.

How manifest it is, that the theory which we have considered, stands *in direct opposition to the most devout dispositions and prayers of good men.* What do sincere Christians desire and pray for so earnestly, as for such an influence of the Holy Spirit, as will certainly and invariably secure them from sin, and lead them to persevering love and obedience? But if God should answer their prayers, and should give the influence which they seek,—if in their love and obedience they should act under so powerful an ab extra cause, a cause so efficaciously producing holiness; then, according to the Essay, we should lose our free moral agency. Now I cannot but think, that every humble, pious man will be inclined to say, I desire no such freedom as would exclude the effectual operations of the Holy Spirit. Let this divine cause govern me invariably; let it direct and control my understanding, my heart and my will, certainly and entirely. I crave it as the choicest blessing, that God would efficaciously work in me both to will and to do, so that, in consequence of that influence, I may uniformly will and do what is pleasing in his sight. Let my agency be constantly and wholly governed by the almighty agency of God. Then I shall have a freedom truly precious,—freedom

from the bondage of sin,—freedom from the influence of my own perverse will and desperately wicked heart,—the glorious freedom of the children of God.

I may add some further remarks at a convenient time. For the present I shall close, after answering very briefly the very brief questions at the close of the Essay.

1. "In what does fatalism consist?"

But why does the author put this question at the end of his Essay, after he has so clearly and fully and confidently answered it himself. The fundamental doctrine of fatalism is, he says, that we choose and act invariably according to the strongest motive, or that the strongest desire or motive is the certain and constant antecedent of our volitions.

2. "What are the different forms of speech in which the doctrine is expressed?"

These will be found in the books, mentioned below, in which the doctrine is taught.

3. "Is there any difference in the real meaning conveyed by these forms?"

This any discerning man can determine, who has time to make the comparison.

4. "Is not fatalism a most pernicious doctrine in its tendencies?"—Answer. The author has settled this also.—"And does it make any difference in the evil, whether it is taught by a wise and pious man, or by the skeptic?"—Answer. It is, in some respects, evidently worse for a pernicious error to be taught by a wise and pious man, than by a skeptic.

5. "What are the books in which fatalism is taught, and by whose influence and authority are they sustained?"

Answer. According to our author, it is taught in Calvin's Institutes, the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms, the works of Edwards, father and son, the works of West, Smally, Bellamy, Dwight, Day, Beecher, and such like. And this same doctrine of fatalism, and the books which teach it, are sustained by the influence of almost all the Presidents of our Colleges, almost all our Theological Professors, almost all the ministers and Christians in New England, almost all the Old School and New School Presbyterians, and almost all the orthodox of other denominations.

ARTICLE VIII.

REVIEW OF THE MEMOIR OF MRS. SARAH LANMAN SMITH.

By the Rev. N. Adams, Boston, Mass.

Memoir of Mrs. Sarah Lanman Smith, late of the Mission in Syria, under the direction of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. By Edward W. Hooker, Pastor of the First Congregational Church, Bennington, Vt. Boston: Perkins & Marvin. Philadelphia: Henry Perkins. 1839. *pp.* 407.

WE have seldom, if ever, read a volume of Christian biography which has interested us more than the one before us. We were personally unacquainted with Mrs. Smith, and, though we had heard her spoken of with commendation, we were not prepared for the intense interest with which we perused this volume. We found ourselves, immediately, in communion with a mind of high order; our pleasure increased with the progress of her history; her dying scene left an impression on our mind almost like that of ascending angels on Jacob's mind at Bethel.

She was born in Norwich, Connecticut, June 18, 1802, and was the daughter of Jabez Huntington, Esq. Her own mother died when Sarah was 7 years old. Her paternal grandfather, Gen. Jedediah Huntington, of New London, an American Officer in the war of the Revolution, was one of the first Corporate Members of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

The first thing which drew our attention in the memoir, was the interesting character of Miss Huntington's conversion. We naturally looked for something in the manner and circumstances of it, corresponding with her subsequently marked and interesting history. In teaching that a knowledge of the time and circumstances of conversion is unimportant, and in attempting, thereby, to encourage those who, in their own cases, cannot identify them, we are in danger of overlooking another truth,—that a clear experience at conversion is eminently useful in the progress of the christian life. No doubt, there is danger, in dwelling much upon this truth, of encouraging the expectation of vivid impressions, and of leading the attention from the substantial

nature of Christian experience, to the circumstances in which it occurred,—thereby countenancing visionary or imaginative minds in depending upon dreams and impressions, while, moreover, there is danger that the judicious and sincere may sometimes be tempted to rely on the providential circumstances, rather than upon the practical and continuous evidences, of the new birth. Religious experience at conversion, it is true, will generally partake of the natural temperament of the individual, and we cannot expect a manifestation of religious feeling inconsistent with the general habits of the mind. As the falling snow lies down upon the landscape, and takes the prominences of it for its own features, so divine grace in regeneration quietly assumes the natural characteristics of the individual mind, and thus, with infinite wisdom and beauty, preserves the distinguishing traits of individual character. We ought not, therefore, to complain, if particular cases of conversion do not present those evidences of remarkable power which leave no doubt of the reality of regeneration.

But when we meet with a case of conversion, in which the rapid process of thoughts and feelings, and sudden disclosures to the mind of spiritual truths, and the breaking up of the fountains of the great deep in the soul, give unequivocal proofs of the Spirit's power, there is nothing more intensely interesting to a religious mind, nothing of a more thrilling and affecting nature in the subsequent recollections of the convert. Who can doubt that much of Paul's confidence, and zeal, and love, and of his religious enjoyment, was owing to the striking manner of his conversion? His course through life was as though he had sailed out of a rapid river into the sea, and that river, with a strong current, ran with him across the deep. Some delight in the declaration that God was not in the earthquake, but in the still small voice. God *was* in the earthquake, at Philippi. Elijah needed the still small voice to reprove his want of confidence in the power of God; but the jailor's prison must be shaken to its foundation that he may be brought to Christ. We believe that one part of the instruction which angelic beings will derive from the work of human redemption will be in the relation, by individual souls, of their experience in regeneration. To us on earth it is a theme that never tires. To hear from individuals of clear conceptions, and strong feelings, and evident

piety, what God has done for their souls, sometimes awakens as strong an interest as our natures can sustain.

We were thus interested in the religious experience of Miss Huntington. She had, for a long time, been the subject of much prayer and faithful Christian effort.

"In returning one evening, however, from a prayer meeting, an intimate friend took occasion to speak to her, plainly, of her spiritual state. She then wept, and opened the feelings of her heart. This was on Tuesday evening. Wednesday passed without any thing special, except that at a sewing-circle, she chose the more serious part of the company; and, entering into conversation respecting the submission of the sinner to God, she advanced the sentiment that a clear understanding of the *nature* of submission would ensure the *act*. The next morning she awoke with a deep impression that it would be her last day of grace; that God would cut her off or harden her heart, or in some way put an end to her probation. In the evening she attended the regular Thursday conference, and before leaving home knelt down and earnestly prayed that it might be the evening of her submission to the Saviour. It was so. Before the meeting closed, while the assembly was at prayer, she gave up her heart to God. She did it in the full exercise of her understanding, and felt then, and afterwards, that it was peculiarly a rational act. This was on the 10th of August, 1820." p. 20.
"On reaching home she threw herself upon her bed; and then had such views of her heart as she never had before. She felt that she was a sinner against God, and loved to sin, and she abhorred herself for it. It was an hour of intense conviction of her sinfulness. Overwhelmed with it, she knelt by her bed, went again to her Saviour, and then found permanent relief." p. 21.

While multitudes know nothing of the time or manner of their conversion, yet give undoubted evidence of piety, it is interesting to meet with those who came into spiritual life almost with the vivid consciousness with which we may suppose angels wake into being.

The reader of the memoir is struck with the entire consecration to Christ which marked Miss Huntington's early Christian character. It was so unreserved, and with such deep emotions, as to leave no doubt of its sincerity. She did not, like many others, relapse from that state of Christian feeling and from that Christian conduct, which attended and followed her conversion, into indifference and worldliness, or become one of that great class of whom, as Christians, you have some hope and much fear. Her path, from the first dawn of Christian hope in her soul, was like the morning—gradually, but perceptibly and beautifully, progressive.

She seems to have been an instance of uniform and rapid advancement towards Christian excellence, from her conversion, and like the star that

"Springs lively up in th' Orient,"

she grew brighter and brighter till, with her, it was perfect day.

The early Christian experience of an interesting young female, of good understanding and of high moral accomplishments, who becomes eminently pious, is exceedingly beautiful. We would not prefer it, in our comparison, to the forcible and manly spirit of a youth, of equal religious decision. Each is beautiful in its season, but the female character shows us religious principles and sentiments with a suffusion of soft light, that charms the heart in coincidence with the power of woman over our best affections.

Soon after her conversion, Miss Huntington began to manifest strong affection for missionary labor. The refined and cultivated circles of Norwich gave her all the social enjoyment she desired, but she seemed at times, by her feelings and expressions with regard to opportunities of greater usefulness, like a bird that belongs to another latitude.

"To make and receive visits, exchange friendly salutations, attend to one's wardrobe, cultivate a garden, read good and entertaining books, and even attend religious meetings for one's own enjoyment; all this does not satisfy me. I want to be where every arrangement will have unreserved and constant reference to eternity. On missionary ground I expect to find new and unlooked for trials and hindrances; still it is my choice to be there. And so far from looking upon it as a difficult task to sacrifice my home and country, I feel as if I should 'flee as a bird to her mountain.'" p. 24.

In her correspondence about this time, and for several years following, Miss Huntington appears to be under the influence of deep spiritual feeling, and wherever she is, and whatever subject engages her pen, the importance of living for heaven, and of being supremely devoted to Christ, seems to give character to her actions and words. One thing is noticeable in this connection;—the apparent purity of her religious feelings, the absence of cant, and of affected sentiment. Her feelings had no need of frequent interjections for their exponents; there was nothing of the conventicle in

her religious expressions, nor of that ardour which is merely animal, and which often passes as religious emotion, for more than the standard value. In her letters, written under intense excitement, there are fewer things exceptionable to severe critical taste than are commonly found in such effusions. Propriety seemed to be so natural to her in the expression of her feelings, that in her freest communications she was correct and not cold, and sufficiently precise, yet natural and easy. Throughout the volume, we were struck with her remarkable talent in expressing her thoughts. It is not so much the 'curiosa felicitas' of feminine expression, as a native chasteness of thought, which seems to characterize her style.

Her religious character, as a sister, is worthy of commendation and love.

"Miss Huntington had three brothers, whom she loved with most exemplary tenderness; and in whose temporal, but especially spiritual good, she felt a habitual and intense interest. How they would prosper in the things of this life, but much more, how they should live here so as to glorify God, and arrive at heaven, were subjects on which she frequently disclosed her anxiety, to them and to her Christian relatives." p. 33.

We shall illustrate this by a few quotations from her letters, in which, moreover, will be seen the sincerity and strength of her religious feelings.

"I wrote to him on new year's day, upon the subject of religion, and told him that I should every day offer a prayer for him in his own chamber. He received it kindly, but made no reply." p. 33.

"Your mind is naturally inclined a little to romantic sentiment; and the leisure which you have had for reading and reflection, have carried you rather above the common level. From these causes, I can easily appreciate all the feelings which you manifest. These intellectual features, my dear E., while they show themselves in the midst of the routine of sober duty, render a character more interesting; but if permitted to assume the control, and to lead one from rational and necessary employments to a romantic and visionary course, they destroy all harmony of character, and generally bring their victim to unlooked for misfortunes." p. 35.

"I would recommend to you, my dear brother, to say nothing more to any one upon the subject of your feelings, but *go to God*, who alone can help you; and read *nothing at all* but the Bible. Mr. Temple, who addressed us this P. M. says, 'the Spirit may be talked away.' It does relieve us to converse; yet we should seek no relief in this case but at the cross. You are still in 'slippery places.' Haste away, my brother;

oh haste! You gain nothing while you delay; you lose ground. Do not prescribe any particular course to God, or expect any precise method. Scarcely two cases agree precisely. Go in earnest prayer to God; 'look on him whom you have pierced, and mourn,' and when we next hear, tell us that you will join our happy company." p. 37.

An interesting part of this volume is the judicious selection and arrangement, by the compiler, of extracts from Miss Huntington's epistolary, and other writings, upon practical religious subjects. In reading them, we are impressed with the thought, that religion, with her, was the atmosphere in which she lived. Her incidental remarks upon questions of casuistry and expediency, show good judgment and well disciplined habits of reflection.

In the year 1831, she became interested in the remnant of the tribe of Mohegan Indians, near Norwich. She visited them for some time on the Sabbath, walking six miles for this purpose, and instructed their children.

"It is astonishing what effect is produced upon my social interests by an absence from our church every Sabbath. I scarcely know who are in town, or how the congregation look. Yet it is a self-denial which ought to be practised for the good of others. The missionaries give up every thing." p. 109.

Through her instrumentality, a grant of $900 was made by the General Government, for the benefit of the Mohegans. A meeting-house was built for them wholly by contributions obtained in Norwich by herself and another lady, her first companion in these benevolent labors.

These efforts quickened her latent desire to be engaged in the foreign missionary service:

"Our annual (1831) meeting of the Foreign Missionary Society was very interesting. I then made the resolution, that whenever my dear parents want me no longer, if unfettered as I am now, I shall devote myself personally to a mission among the heathen. So you may consider me henceforth *a missionary in heart;* and when circumstances favor, must be ready to resign me, unless God should put insurmountable obstacles in my way." p. 110.

In 1833 she became the wife of Mr. Smith. Her letter to her father informing him of the proposal of marriage, and detailing the history of her missionary feelings is given in the volume. It is, both for its subject and in its manner, above praise.

We shall not attempt a description of the various scenes pertaining to the breaking up of her many associations in her native land previous to her embarkation. In her letters and journal about this time, there are, as might be expected, many rich, solemn, joyous, mournful feelings in anticipation of the coming separation from home, which remind us of broken clouds that throng the sun-set, and fling forth their dishevelled, yet quiet rays. There are times in the lives of all who are called to great sacrifices, in which, as all do in the event of death, they can understand something of the intermingling pathos and sublimity in those words of Christ, 'Father, the hour is come!' The moment when a missionary, and especially a female missionary, feels that she is leaving home, for ever,—the moment,—and there is always such a moment,—when it breaks upon the mind, with full force, that the departure is at hand, and the excitements of preparation which had diverted the feelings subside, and a

> 'twilight gray,'
> Has 'in her sober livery all things clad,'

there is a rush of feelings around the heart, a rapid, anxious, trembling inquiry into the motives and the principles by which this solemn juncture of retrospection on the whole of a previous life, and anticipation of a new world of thought, and experience, and labor, has been occasioned. Images of past scenes and friends glance in hurried confusion before the mind; chimes of departed hours and years sound out full many a tale; the future throws its great shadows across into the past, and existence becomes for a time, a blending together of the past, and the future. It is almost like the turn of a century to a departed soul:—like old and new year, where years are ages. It is not sufficient at such times that our motives are good, to keep the emotions at regular tides. A cup is put into the hand, which, in transient moments of misgiving, it is almost wished might pass away.—Here are some of the feelings which Mrs. Smith recorded upon the eve of her departure.

"Monday morning we bid a final adieu, the sorrows of which were somewhat alleviated by the possibility of meeting again, before our embarkation. It really threw around our aged parents a dignity which angels might admire, to see them thus relinquish the object of their fond regard, to the cause which angels love, and angels serve. May the

richest blessings of God's grace rest upon them, and upon you, my dear parents, who make the same cheerful surrender." p. 143.

"You will naturally imagine that dear P. has been brought to mind, and that many tender associations are connected with him. There stands the rocking-chair which he occupied, and when I lie down upon the bed, I can almost imagine that I hear his steps in the adjoining chamber. But while that precious form moulders in the grave, the released spirit is in far higher and holier society above, from whence I would not recall him, if I could.

> 'There entertain him all ye saints above,
> In solemn troops and sweet societies
> That sing, and singing in your glory move,
> And wipe the tears forever from his eyes.'" p. 144.

"Many times during the day I closed my eyes, and said to myself, 'can it be that I shall behold those loved faces *no more*, until we meet in eternity?'" p. 144.

"And now, my dear father, I take my pen for the last time, and address myself to you. Nature struggles hard, and I stop to wipe the tears which gather fast, and intercept the traces of my pen. But I must not indulge myself in saying what is in my heart. God only knows those deep, *deep* fountains of feeling which he has created there." p. 150.

But some have said: Men can leave home and friends for earthly treasure, without such feelings. They can spend years in foreign climes, nay, with their immediate families, they can exile themselves for life, to obtain wealth. Why should it be considered, and why, to the individuals themselves should it prove, such a trial of feeling, and such a sacrifice, to go upon a foreign mission?

We think the answer is given in the statement of the case. The love of gain is such an all-absorbing passion, that it drowns the best affections of the heart. The insensibility with which men bear long exile from home for the sake of gain is no virtue. So that one reason why foreign missionaries find it a sacrifice of feeling to leave their country and kindred, is, No cancerous passion, like the love of money, kills their natural affections, and benumbs their sensibilities; but on the contrary, the benevolent feelings which lead them to a foreign land, strengthen the whole current of their good affections:—as the fountains feel the effect of the shower, as well as the earth for which it was intended. An illustration of the paralizing effect of the love of money upon the affections, and a confirmation of what we have now said, is the fact, that when men go forth upon

secular expeditions which have a virtuous or purely benevolent object, they manifest reluctance and regret, and suffer pain proportionably as great as foreign missionaries, who leave their native lands for life.

In passing through a scene which has been the object of long and intense expectation, we sometimes wonder that we are so insensible, compared with what we supposed would be the case. But we have for so long a time imagined all the possible feelings incident to the scene or the event in prospect, that, when it comes, nothing new occurs to affect the sensibilities with a higher excitement. This, no doubt, oftentimes proves a merciful arrangement of Providence, the trial of feeling being permitted to occur when alleviations of grief are at hand. Accordingly, we find that notwithstanding Mrs. Smith's acute feelings in breaking away from her friends, when the hour of embarkation came she was composed and happy. By the pilot, she wrote as follows:

"I stood upon deck till I saw the waving of the last handkerchief, and Mr. E.'s white hat, as he stood alone upon the shrouds."

"From first stepping on board, my heart has been stayed up with the Scripture which I repeated this morning—'For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life; nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers; nor things present, nor things to come; nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.' * * * God's kingdom seems more glorious than any thing else; thanks to his grace. * * * Adieu, dear, *dear* friends. My heart feels what I cannot express." p. 153.

The date of the embarkation is inadvertently omitted. The same is true of some other interesting events in the memoir. If the dates can be given in another edition, it will add to the interest of the book.

Mrs. Smith had a correct eye for the beauties of creation, a talent at describing them naturally, a perception of little things, and characteristic features, unnoticed by a common eye.

"As I was taking dinner to-day, a sweet little land bird, which had been hovering around the deck, perched in the window. Its size that of a robin, its plumage black and white. But it had not the calm and buoyant look of the sweet songsters among my native hills. It seemed wearied and ruffled, like some solitary wanderer. It was five hundred miles from its home, the Western Islands." p. 155.

To this we would add, if we had room, her description of a sun-rise scene at sea, and several other passages of exquisite beauty.

The mission to which Mrs. Smith went forth is the mission in Syria, which includes the mission in the Holy Land. Her designation was to the Syrian mission proper, the seat of whose operations is Beyroot. This place is interesting for its ancient history, and for its present and prospective importance in missionary affairs. Its ancient name is Berytus, derived, as some suppose, from Beroe, a nymph of the ocean. It was a town of Phœnicia. The kings of Egypt originally possessed it, but by the conquests of Antiochus the Great, it became subject to the kings of Syria, till the time of Diodotus, who destroyed it, B. C. 140. After their conquest of Syria, the Romans rebuilt this place near its original spot. Agrippa, the grandson of Herod the Great, lavished his wealth upon it in the erection of a theatre, amphitheatre, porticoes and baths. Josephus speaks of the splendid games established there by Agrippa. To this place the celebrated Titus came, after his capture of Jerusalem, to honor the birthday of his father. (Josephus de Bello.) Berytus was noted for the celebrated academy of law established there, by which it was as famous in the east for its advantages in the civil law, as Rome was in the west. It is not known when this Academy was established, but a decree of Diocletian concerning it exists, which makes it more ancient than A. D. 384. It is believed to have flourished from the 3d. to the 6th. century. Law was taught there in the Greek tongue, and Justinian called it the mother and nurse of the laws. He allowed no academies but those of Rome, *Berytus*, and Constantinople, to explain the laws, and he brought two men from the academy at Berytus to join with others in preparing his Digests. In the 25th. year of Justinian, A. D. 551, July 9th., the city was overthrown by an earthquake. The Ottoman Turks became the masters of Syria nearly three centuries ago, under whom it was divided into five pachalics, viz.: Aleppo, Tripoli, Damascus, Acre and Palestine. Beyroot is in the pachalic of Acre. The extension of the Egyptian power, now under Mohammed Ali, to this region, has changed its political relations. Beyroot is situated in a plain which extends from the foot of Mount

Lebanon into the sea. It is surrounded by a wall of the same material with which the houses are built, and which, when taken from the quarry, can be cut with an axe. It can be pierced by a cannon ball without breaking or crumbling. From this place the Maronites and Druses export their cottons and silks, chiefly to Cairo. It is the commercial centre of a large extent of country, and a most interesting point of future radiation in the missionary enterprize. A moment's inspection of the map of Syria and the countries adjacent will show its interesting relations in a moral view. Antioch, Damascus, Mesopotamia, and other places of sacred interest, may one day be evangelized from this missionary establishment. As yet we can only say of it, in relation to these places, and through them again to others:

> 'The mountain *looks* on Marathon,
> And Marathon looks on the sea!'

We have already referred to Mrs. Smith's love for natural objects. The associations, and the scenery of her field of labor, gratified her tasteful sensibilities, and employed her talent at description.

She made a journey of nine days to the ruins of Baalbeck, and the top of Sunneen, the highest peak of Lebanon.

"Just after sundown I stepped out of my tent, and going a few paces towards the west, upon the brink of a deep valley, one of the most sublime views met my eyes that I ever saw. A rich bed of superb white clouds, rolling together, and curling their tops in the air, in the most fantastic forms, filled the valley, occasionally breaking from each other sufficiently to discover to me the grandeur of the depth below. Beyond them stretched the glorious sea, its outline nearly obscured by the blending of its waters with the brilliant tints of the western sky. As I stood alone, gazing upon this almost unearthly scene, the distant voices of the mountaineers, pursuing their occupations upon the declivities below, came up through this magnificent array of mountain drapery, and produced a most singular effect upon my senses. I almost imagined myself to be the inhabitant of another sphere, stooping down to discover the pursuits of an inferior world, whose occupants little imagined what glories were above them." p. 205.

"Evening.—Mr. Smith and myself took a walk at sunset, the air being mild, and the clouds brilliant. The foliage of the distant grove of palm trees gave surpassing beauty to the scene. Unlike other trees, when viewed from a distance, their outline is distinct but graceful. Pompey's pillar, in its simple beauty, rose behind these elegant clusters. We stood upon a slight elevation, just as the sun dipped his last lines

below the horizon; when a discharge of small guns, from the fleet in the harbor, was heard, followed by the evening tattoo. Immediately we perceived the flags of the minarets hoisted, and from a small door on the south side towards Mecca, which opens into a gallery near the top, appeared the criers, whose voices we distinctly heard, as they resounded through the soft air of an Egyptian evening. The whole scene was impressive, yet affecting; while the contrast which was presented by the works of creation, and the moral darkness around us, brought forcibly to our minds those lines of Heber,

> 'Though every prospect pleases,
> And only man is vile.'" p. 171.

"Sabbath Evening, November 1.—To-day we have had our second storm, the first having occurred about ten days since. Both were violent and accompanied with thunder and lightning. My nerves are becoming accustomed to the tremendous peals and vivid flashes of a Mediterranean thunder storm. It is sublime, and at first terrifying, to watch the lightning's play over the deep blue sea; and during the live long night listen to the thunder's roar as it reverberates through the range of Mount Lebanon." p. 290.

We will give a few brief extracts illustrating the character of Mrs. Smith's practical missionary feelings. Our first quotation is invaluable.

"I need not dwell long, at present, upon the highest requisite qualification for a missionary, though I should love to occupy many pages with it. You will readily believe that no common degree of love to God and love to man, will suffice for a foundation, in forming yourself to become one. I will only remark, that this must be acquired by daily and prolonged communion with God. You must not only take a few minutes, at regular seasons, for prayer; but you must secure some of your most valuable hours; and so occupy yourself in them as to get *near* to God; and so as to bring eternal things near to you, that you may throw your entire self into the work which engages his infinite mind; and that every thing beside may dwindle to a point. Although I am very far from setting myself as a standard—on the contrary am continually lamenting my deficiencies; yet I can say, that if I have any heart for my work, I look back upon the hours of retirement and devotion which, before I knew my destination, were spent in my own chamber, in my father's house, and when the beautiful stars of the morning were my only light—as the means of obtaining this heart. I have also found great profit from whole days of private fasting and prayer. You will derive particular benefit from such seasons, having a known and definite object in view. If you pursue an undeviating course of secret devotion, without neglecting your active duties, your soul will gradually rise to higher and still higher perceptions of truth and personal obligation; and when you reach the land of darkness, where, within the loyal dominions of 'the prince of the power of the air,' even the regenerate have greater struggles with their depraved natures; past joys and motives will come back

upon your soul to refresh and strengthen you; and like David, you will remember God 'from the land of Jordan and of the Hermonites, and from the hill of Mizar.'" p. 228—9.

"Have you not thought that missionaries are in danger of placing too high a value upon the sacrifice which they make, in consequence of the sympathy, and, perhaps, I may say, pity, with which they are regarded by those whom they leave behind? I long to see the churches at home feel that they are only discharging an obligation to the Redeemer, when they send their best, their fairest, their most beloved to distant regions to declare his name." p. 279.

"I am hoping to live here to be very old; if so, I think that in thirty, or forty, or fifty years, I may behold some important changes for the better." p. 327.

"As I was walking before breakfast upon the terrace of Mr. Bird's house, I saw a group of females who had just returned from worshipping amid

——'the pomp that charms the eye,
And rites adorned with gold.'

There is almost a moral certainty that after these, my sisters, have stepped beyond the boundaries of time, not a ray of comfort will ever beam upon them, through the endless duration of their existence. So overwhelming was the impression of that moment, that I felt I could not live long, should it continue. My husband joined me in my walk just then, and we talked over these affecting truths; and felt, as I hope we shall continue to do, that our very existence should be identified with them." p. 183.

We give the following from different parts of the book as interesting incidents of pious feeling. Speaking of the death of the Rev. Mr. Dodge, missionary at Jerusalem:

"When I was an inmate of his family, I found that he uniformly rose very early; and from his increasing spiritual views and tender sensibilities, it was evident that he held much communion with God. His case confirms me in the long-cherished belief that secret prayer is the key to holy living and a happy death." p. 222.

"I find it quite another thing to be the mistress of a family, from what it was to be a daughter in a father's house. The former station involves a thousand cares, of which in the other I had no knowledge. And in this land too, which furnishes no external aid, but on the contrary every thing to impede the progress of moral influence, the spirits sometimes sink beneath the weight of responsibility. However, I love to think that the Saviour pleased not himself, even on the Sabbath: so should I rejoice to give the whole seven days to him and to my fellow beings." p. 290.

We had marked for insertion, in this place, several miscellaneous things in her journal of various interest.

"A servant woman of Mrs. Whiting, who has now lived long enough with her to love her and appreciate her principles, about a year and a

half since remarked to some of the Arabs, that the people with whom she lived, did 'not lie, nor steal, nor quarrel, nor do any such things; but, poor creatures,' said she, 'they have no religion.'" p. 215.

"If those females in America, who decline leading the devotions of a social circle, feel any thing of the reluctance which I felt in attempting to pray in the native tongue, I pity more than I blame them; yet if they would cast themselves upon God, as I was enabled to do, I doubt not that similar strength would be imparted. My first effort of the kind, in this difficult language, was with my little girl, and I pursue it regularly." p. 231.

Her husband says:

"One who should have gone into the school, would have found Mrs. Smith seated on a low stool, with six or eight bright little girls, half surrounding her, and in their eagerness to catch her instructions bending forward till their heads often formed a semicircle very near her own; while their lively faces, and animated inquiries, showed the interest excited by the words that fell from her lips. The scene was edifying to those who constantly witnessed it; and she was often heard to affirm, that she never had a more interesting and improving class at home, than this which she here trained up, of untutored Arab girls." p. 389.

"We find the children quite as capable of forming musical sounds as those in our own country; but alas, we have no hymns or psalms adapted to their capacities. The Arabic cannot be simplified like the English, without doing violence to Arab taste; at least, such is the opinion now. What changes may be wrought in the language we cannot tell. This obstacle in the instruction of the young here, you have not perhaps thought of. American youth have extraordinary privileges. It is a painful thought to us, that children's literature, if I may so term it, is incompatible with the genius of this language; of course, infant school lessons must be bereft of many of their attractions. Mr. Smith and Mr. Whiting have each superintended a translation of the first part of the 'Child's Book on the Soul;' the use of which must prove its adaptedness to Arab children." p. 296.

The book spoken of below was a pocket Testament, and the lines here quoted, were written by her on one of its blank leaves, probably not far from the close of her life.

"When you presented me with this precious little book, my dear brother, you probably did not expect to see it again. It has been my companion in all my wanderings since I left my native land. And now I return it to you, for the single reason, that it has made a visit to the Garden of Gethsemane. In that spot I seated myself, and in solitude perused, Matthew xxvi. 36—56, with peculiar feelings; and then I plucked the sprig which you will find herein. Take this little Testament to your communion table, and urge upon your church, once more, the parting command of their suffering Saviour. p. 332.

SARAH L. SMITH."

The compiler makes the following just remarks in the beginning of the chapter which describes Mrs. Smith's residence at Beyroot.

"It is doubtless proper that missionaries should be contemplated, not only in their labors, cares and trials, but also in their social character and enjoyments; and in those pleasant local circumstances in which Divine Providence places them, conducive to their comfort and happiness. If there be any Christian in the wide world, to whom a pleasant residence, and the enjoyments of social life, and of a cultivated taste and intellect, are desirable and reasonable, it is the missionary. And the Christian at home, of generous sentiments, will rejoice to know that the 'laborer' whom his contributions are sustaining in a foreign land, finds some of the same temporal blessings which are bestowed upon himself; and will never take it up as a reproach against him, that he finds enjoyment in his field of service." p. 269.

Let us now hear Mrs. Smith's description of her place of residence.

"You would perhaps like to have me give you some description of our residence. It belongs to one of the wealthiest and most respectable families in Beyroot; is situated in the midst of gardens of mulberry trees, retired from the road, yet very accessible. It is built of stone, with a flat roof; and beside the rooms of the press, has upon the lower floor, a kitchen, store-room, lumber-room, servant's room and bath; all of which surround a large covered court, opening upon a pretty little flower garden, between which and the court is an awning of grape vines, whose luxuriant fruit is beginning to enrich our social board. Upon the second story, which we occupy, are a large dining-room, a bed-room, study, room for R., my little girl, and two rooms beside are now being built. These occupy the sides of a beautiful open court, where we can sit and gaze upon the illimitable sea which stretches out before us; and every evening we may see the sun sink behind its peaceful waters. The morning and evening skies here are brilliant beyond description. When 'bright aurora streaks the eastern sky,' before the sun shows his head above Mount Lebanon, we rise from our undisturbed slumbers, and after a season of retirement, Mr. Smith works in the garden an hour, which greatly promotes his health and cheerfulness; and when he comes up at 7 o'clock to prayers, he seldom fails to bring me a rose, jessamine, or carnation pink, to add to the choice bouquet upon my work table. The flower garden contains orange, lemon, and pomegranate trees in full bearing; and behind the house is a garden somewhat larger, containing apple, peach, plum, apricot, and mulberry trees.

"In reading my description of our situation you must remember that this is the dry season of the year, and that next winter, when the porous walls admit the rain and damp, we shall perhaps sometimes think of your superior comforts. In taking this house, we had in view accommodating the press, as well as promoting our own health; and we often speak of the overruling Providence which has furnished us with so pleasant a spot." p. 273—4.

As married men and students, we must not omit the following. Speaking of Mr. Smith's arduous labors in connection with the press, the entire responsibility of the preaching in Arabic, the Sabbath School, and the service in English every alternate Sabbath, she adds:

"He has, however, a most delightful study, in the most airy and conspicuous part of the house, looking forth upon the waters of the azure sea, and the verdure of the variegated landscape which intervenes." p. 295.

In the name of all literary husbands, we affix to the above our heartfelt commendation.

If any one, in reading the two last extracts, is tempted with Iscariot's feelings at the alabaster box of ointment, we commend him to the following passages:

"Last year, you recollect, we lived in one room at the mountains, where we were favored with nightly visits from jackalls."

"Mr. S. returned on Saturday, at noon after a fatiguing ride. He found some favorable opportunities for religious conversation; but he says that he thinks that Satan employs filth and vermin to deter missionaries from seeking intercourse with his subjects. Missionaries who are stationary can enjoy cleanliness and comforts in their own habitations, however humble they may be; but those who itinerate, 'without purse or scrip,' depending upon the accommodations which the country affords, have actual experience of the self-denial which our Saviour and his followers exercised. I can readily imagine what groups surrounded the benevolent Saviour in his wanderings, whom his disciples sometimes wished to drive from his presence, but never with his consent." p. 283—4.

"Sometimes when I am occupying an early hour in the few domestic cares in which I allow myself, and half a dozen Arab females parade into the room, I am obliged to summon all my benevolence and recollection, to enable me to perform the rites of hospitality with perfect cheerfulness. 'For this cause was I sent,' are words which frequently come into my mind of late, when thus interrupted." p. 235.

Here is a missionary trial which we, at home, do not feel every time that we receive letters:

"I cannot be sufficiently thankful that my own dear family circle remains unbroken. I never receive a parcel from America, without lifting up my heart to God that I may be prepared for whatever intelligence it may contain." p. 236.

Here is another missionary experience whose bitterness only the heart that feels it, knows:

"While every important want has been supplied, and innumerable comforts and refinements added, which I never anticipated as a missionary; I have scarcely passed one quiet American day since I parted from you. From the hour that I lost sight of my native shore, I have been fully aware that I had thrown myself into the wide and wicked world, and forever deprived myself of the moral repose and security which my once favored home had furnished. But I have never for a moment regretted the step which I took. 'There remaineth a rest,' which, if permitted to partake of it, I shall enjoy more highly, for the labors and disquietudes, and the new and deeper views of spiritual truths which this expatriation has occasioned." p. 295.

We should omit an interesting feature in Mrs. Smith's life and character, if we did not refer to her peculiar affection for her father. Perhaps the early loss of her mother concentrated her filial affections upon the surviving parent, though we should judge that the feeling now referred to was, in a great measure, original. The affection of daughters for their fathers, and of sons for their mothers, of which we frequently see striking cases, are beautiful instances of a sort of cross-play in nature. The susceptibility of a daughter to deep impression by the contrast, in her father, to her feminine nature, and a son's impression in the same way, by his mother,—the daughter yielding herself, thereby, to reverential affection, and the son to love, shows, in the individual, a fine moral structure, which, however it may, in many instances, be covered up by predominating inclinations to evil, is always a redeeming principle in the character, and under genial influences, bears precious fruit. A son in whose heart his mother holds a natural sway, is like the sea, which is oftentimes swollen and troubled, but around which the moon keeps her gentle bands, and its waves are stayed. A daughter's love for her father has more of worship in it. Amongst the harmonies of her social nature, it is a deep, rich base. Her affections, naturally inclined to something beyond her own sex, are like that honey-suckle whose small tenacious nodes upon the stem attach it firmly to the support on which it grows, and while it looks abroad, keep it, by its voluntary attachment, fast to the door post on which it ran in youth. We have seen instances of a

daughter's love for her father which was equal in strength to any human affection. One of the most interesting images in our recollections of the memoir before us, is,—this missionary female, on the highest summit of 'that goodly mountain,' Lebanon, saying, "It is my father's birth day!" Were there a Daguerreoscope for moral sketches, we would fix that little incident in a picture of silver.

Let us once more look at her as a sister, in a foreign land.

"Since returning to our room, I have read a chapter in 'Martha,' to Mr. Smith—the one containing a description of natural scenery, in which she became much absorbed on a certain evening; and as the writer sat beside her, watching the emotions of her soul depicted in her countenance, she turned to him and exclaimed, 'Brother!' That one word awakened in my breast such powerful and tender associations as to choke my utterance, and I was obliged to stop, and wipe the falling tears before I could proceed. I had so much enjoyment with my own dear brothers, and received from them so much affection and kindness, that my recollections of the fraternal relation are exceedingly touching and unalloyed." p. 285.

"December 24.—In dating a note to Mrs. Dodge, inviting her to meet our other friends here on Christmas day, I am reminded that this is the anniversary of our dear P.'s death. Dear brother! I weep to think of thee as the sweet little child whom I led to school; as the buoyant boy, the college youth, and the gentle and dignified man. In the new heavens and the new earth, I trust we shall unite our hearts and our hands, in the service and in the presence of our divine Redeemer." p. 297.

She who had, in the degree which we have now seen, the most refined feelings of our nature, was doomed to sorrow. In the fall of 1835, the new school-house where she taught was injured by the periodical rain, the walls and floor being literally soaked, and the consequence was, that she took a violent cold which immediately fastened upon her lungs. She continued through the winter of that year, with but little abatement, to discharge her usual duties; but when spring came, she gave symptoms of being seriously diseased. She was advised to give up labor, and as her husband was about to visit Smyrna on business connected with the press, she concluded to embark with him.

Five days after leaving Beyroot, they met with bad weather, and between 9 and 10 o'clock, the vessel struck upon a reef. This is her description of a part of the scene:

"In the mean time, crash after crash succeeded the first, some of

them exceedingly terrific, threatening the entire and speedy destruction of the vessel. But amid the confusion on deck, I remained calmly upon my seat. From the first moment of danger my mind reverted to the long boat, and some desolate shore; while hope predominated that we should escape with our lives. Presently Mr. Smith again appeared at the cabin door, and called me above. The tossing of the poor broken vessel upon the rocks interfered with the lowering of the boat, while a wave broke over the deck just as I reached it. I spoke not a word; but as I turned towards the place where they were lowering the boat, supported by my anxious husband, the mild rays of the evening star caught my eye, as it was just about to descend below the horizon; and it seemed like the star of hope." p. 337.

The scene of escape from the vessel, the perils and hardships which succeeded, must be read in her own simple and touching language to be fully understood. We cannot withhold the following passage.

"The gentlemen went in search of a resting place for the day, and soon returned, saying that they had found a habitation, to which they invited me to resort. It was a ruined stone building, which appeared to have been used for a stable, by the nomadic Turkmans, during the winter. We had the floor, which was earth, swept and covered with the fresh branches of trees. My bed was spread in the most comfortable part; and as I entered, I can assure you it seemed as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land. This was my birth-day; and although in every respect the most sorrowful of any that I had passed, perhaps none ever found me with so many causes for gratitude." p. 342.

Her feelings of kindness to a poor, dissipated, sick, young Englishman, who subjected her, in the boat, and in their rude shelter, to much inconvenience, her attempts to soothe his irritated and despairing mind, her enjoyment of the religious service on the Sabbath in their poor hut, with her black shawl spread on some stones for their common seat, are interesting illustrations of her character under suffering.

Thirty three days after her embarkation at Beyroot, and twenty eight from the time of her shipwreck, she arrived at Smyrna. The morning after her arrival she found herself very weak, and retired to her bed. Her husband describes this as a sad hour; the hope of recovery and of further usefulness seemed ready to leave her. The scene between them as they wept together at the thought of her decline, and her feelings towards home, will be read with the deepest sympathy and interest.

Many things in her last sickness, and in her dying scene,

afford unusually fruitful themes of meditation and instruction. A practical English writer and divine, says, "Tell me not how a man dies; show me how he lived." We doubt the truth of this feeling;—the life and the death of the good are to be considered together, according to that scripture, "Mark the perfect man and behold the upright: for the *end* of that man is peace." It is extremely interesting to know how this truly pious and devoted woman felt when she came to die. Her husband says, in a letter to her parents,

"Her feelings, when she came now to look at her course as inevitably tending downward to the grave, were far from being such as she wished.—The same trait of character, that made the thought of leaving you so painful, made also the anticipation of being taken from her other numerous friends, a source of the most sorrowful feelings. You know how ardent, and how many were the friendships she cherished. When she came to think of their all being rent asunder, she said, much as had been the pleasure she had derived from them, it were almost better to have no friends. But having given you up, the severest pang was over, and as she drew near eternity, other feelings threw a shade over these. She did not love the world in a bad sense; and yet it was evident that death was to a degree taking her unawares; and was occasioning her a most trying disappointment." p. 348.

Two things were forcibly impressed upon our mind in reading this part of Mr. Smith's letter, viz. The perfect naturalness of this grief, and the Christian simplicity and ingenuousness in the narration of it. We are not sure that some would not have chosen to hide this part of our friend's history, preferring to give us only the account of those feelings and remarks which indicate the triumph of faith. It was a strange satisfaction, we must confess, to know that an individual of the undoubted piety and exalted worth of this beloved woman, had sorrow of heart, when, in spirit, she began to say, "Mine age hast thou removed like a shepherd's tent: thou wilt cut me off with pining sickness." It comes to us like the gentleness of Christ, to know that as *all* 'the children are partakers of flesh and blood,' eminent Christians likewise take part in the same, and that we are permitted, by their experience, to feel, that moderated sorrow, (not murmuring or complaining,) at disappointed hope and the prospect of premature death, may consist with evident tokens of acceptance with God. Is not one book of

the Bible a book of Lamentations? We are always happy to hear that the first intimation of dying is received, by the Christian patient, with composure, much more with pleasure; but we cannot properly regard reluctance at the sacrifice and suffering incident to early death as unfavorable to Christian character. It should be remarked here, that all which is said of Mrs. Smith's first feelings in view of her probable decline and death, make the impression of truth and faithfulness in the whole narration of her life and character.

When she had given up the hope of final recovery, a further trial awaited her. Notwithstanding her past eminent devotedness to the cause of Christ, and her sincere religious principles and feelings, and her frequent seasons of high religious enjoyment, the beginning of her last sickness and her expectation of its fatal issue were cheered with no religious comfort. Such facts as these, and they are not unfrequent, show how entirely religious frames are beyond the control of the will, and that, when we may seem to have ensured religious consolation in sickness, by a good life, God is as much a sovereign in bestowing it, as in any of his gifts. We know of nothing which abases man and exalts God more than this, that spiritual comfort is often withheld from the best of Christians in times of need, without an apparent reason. We may say, indeed, as in the case before us, that the violent shock upon the nervous sensibilities, occasioned by the sudden discovery that death is inevitable, prevents that calm and quiet state of mind which is necessary to faith and hope. Some proximate cause, no doubt, there always is, in every such case; but the permission of it, and the prevalence of doubt and fear for a season, compels the acknowledgment that God's ways are not as our ways. The individual, as in the present case, may be able to answer every question relating to evidences of piety, in a satisfactory manner, and yet have no ray of hope. One incident is worthy of notice in this connection. Mrs. Smith was interested, at this time, to know how far she might be justified in depending upon past experience for evidence of being a Christian. A remark which fell from her upon this point deserves consideration. She said that ministers were in the habit of warning Christians not to trust to past experience for evidence of personal religion,

but when they spoke of departed Christians, they would refer to their lives for evidence of their piety. Perhaps it may be said that the reason is this: In speaking of the departed, we refer to their life as completed, their earlier evidences of piety as confirmed by death:—while, with regard to the living, it is necessary to impress this truth, that '*he that endureth to the end*, shall be saved.'

Another point of great practical importance is suggested by the effort which we are told Mrs. S. made to recollect particular sins, and to repent of them one by one. Mr. Smith judiciously endeavored to dissuade her from it.

"I dissuaded her from pursuing far such an attempt to recall particular transgressions, as calculated at the present time unnecessarily to distress her. God would be better pleased, I assured her, with her passing them over as forgiven and blotted out, through his abounding mercy. She would not err by contenting herself with a more general repentance of her past life, feeling that it had been all imperfection and sin, and abhorring herself on account of it; which, with a great deal of earnestness, she assured me, she most heartily did."—p. 353.

One day she called for the 'Pilgrim's Progress,' and began to read the account of the river of death, but was unable to pursue it. Some time after, her husband, at her request, resumed the narrative, but she was obliged to ask him to stop. She said that it seemed to be a great excellence of the Bible that it was so little exciting; that not only could the most common minds understand it, but the most sensitive nerves could bear its representations, better than those of any other book. She accordingly read, after this, almost wholly in the Bible.

She finally obtained peace and comfort in view of death, and the ground of it seemed to be, entire submission to the will of God. But *she drew her evidence of acceptance with Him, chiefly from what she had previously felt.* She said that, on the whole, it was her choice to die. Freedom in heaven from imperfection, made her wish to be there, and the expected pleasure of meeting departed friends gave her much satisfaction. She thought it absurd to suppose that departed friends in heaven would not recognize each other, and enjoy each other's love.

The few last days of her life were perfectly happy. Having listened to a part of 2 Cor. v. "For we know that if this earthly house," etc. she said that it removed all her

darkness and fears, that she wished for nothing more, and that she was going to be with her Saviour. She said that she had no ecstacies, but that her mind was composed and quiet. "*I believe all that is written in the word of God, and upon the strength of this faith, I am going into eternity.*" Sublime and glorious words!

Two years and four months ago, she had embarked from Boston as a missionary. How much she left behind! How short her missionary life, how great the disappointment at the early interruption of her work by death! "Thou destroyest the hope of man!" And yet

"Sept. 2?.—In the afternoon, she said to me with much earnestness, 'When you write to my friends after all is over, one thing I wish you would make prominent. It is, that I feel satisfied with the course I have taken, and that all has been ordered by God.' [Meaning in her becoming a missionary.] 'I have no disposition to boast of my labors; but I feel that I have not left my friends and my country in vain. I never have regretted having done so, nor do I now. *This is my dying testimony.*'" p. 358.

"'Tell my friends, I would not for all the world lay my remains any where but here, on missionary ground.' After a good many remarks, showing the brightness of her views of spiritual things, some of which could be but indistinctly heard, she exclaimed, 'What a goodly company of ancestors shall I meet there! Yes, and the holy angels, and the Son of God! Oh, the Almighty God! You know nothing of his glorious majesty. I cannot express it; but I wanted to speak of it, that you may think that yourselves are nothing. I have thought too much of myself. In this sickness I have thought it too important that my ease and wants should be consulted. We all think that we are of more importance than we are. Beware of pride.'"

"We sung that beautiful hymn of Doddridge on the eternal Sabbath, commencing,

'Thine earthly Sabbaths, Lord, we love.'

"To my surprise, her voice, which she had so long been unable to use for singing, was occasionally heard mingling with ours. Her face beamed with a smile of ecstasy; and so intense was the feeling expressed in her whole aspect, that we stopped after the first verse, lest she should even expire while drinking the cup of joy we had presented to her. But she said to us, 'Go on;' and though all were bathed in tears, and hardly able to articulate, we proceeded. I was sitting with her hand in mine. While singing the second verse, she pressed it, and turned to me at the same time such a heavenly smile as stopped my utterance. Before we reached the end, she raised both her hands above her head, and gave vent to her feelings in tears of pleasure, and almost in shouting. After prayer, she said, 'I have had a little glimpse of what I am going to see. It was but a glimpse, and perhaps it was imagination. But it seemed a glorious sight.'" p. 360, 1.

In the account of her last moments, we have an interesting fact.

"Involuntary groans were occasionally uttered in her convulsions. These, as we were listening to them with painful sympathy, once to our surprise melted away into musical notes; and for a moment our ears were charmed with the full, clear tones of the sweetest melody. No words were articulated, and she was evidently unconscious of every thing about her. It seemed as if her soul was already joining in the songs of heaven, while it was yet so connected with the body as to command its unconscious sympathy."—p. 364.

We can never forget the effect of this incident upon our minds when we first heard it read. We cannot remember any incident in the dying scene of any individual so peculiar and striking. We have been accustomed to consider the last moments of Mr. Evarts, taking into view his natural temperament, as more remarkable than those of any other departed friend whom we have ever known. One of his exclamations was, "O! the face of God!" Perhaps this was only anticipation; it may have been vision. But the incident just referred to in the last moments of Mrs. Smith, is certainly very striking. Those musical sounds were wonderful. They remind one of those which are said to have come from Memnon's statue at *sunrise*. They were the accidental notes of the harp, when one is removing the strings. The swan's last song is sweetest; so was it with this "bird" when fleeing "to her mountain." The passage last quoted from the memoir will, we doubt not, long be remembered by all who read the book.

"Not long after, she again opened her eyes in a state of consciousness. A smile of perfect happiness lighted up her emaciated features. She looked deliberately around upon different objects in the room, and then fixed upon me a look of the tenderest affection. * * * Her frequent prayers that the Saviour would meet her in the dark valley, have already been mentioned. By her smile, she undoubtedly intended to assure us, that she had found him. Words she could not utter to express what she felt. Life continued to struggle with its last enemy, until twenty minutes before eight o'clock; when her affectionate heart gradually ceased to beat, and her soul took its final departure to be forever with the Lord." p. 364.

She died Sept. 30, 1836, in the 34th year of her age, having been a missionary about two years and four months.

On receiving the intelligence of her death, the American Consul put his flag at half mast, as did all the American vessels in the harbor, eight or ten in number. The ladies at Smyrna contrary to the immemorial custom of the place, followed the remains to the grave. Her grave was the first in a new cemetery, prepared by the English and American residents. At the request of Mr. Smith, the funeral service of the Church of England was read, by the Rev. Mr. Lewis.

The memoir closes with a most interesting chapter by Rev. Mr. Smith on some of the traits of missionary character, and the habits of this lamented servant of Christ; to which is added an appropriate monody by her friend, Mrs. L. H. Sigourney, beginning,—

> "So,—Syria hath thy dust,—thou who wert born
> Amid my own wild hillocks."—

We naturally ask, why this excellent and useful missionary came forth as a flower and was cut down? Recollections of similar events crowd upon our minds. We have almost wondered whether missionary labor is performed in any other part of the universe. If so, we see apparent reason in the removal of able and accomplished laborers from this field, that they may preach to other spirits the unsearchable riches of Christ. But we check such fancies. We think of our common doom, to die. No one can be too good or too useful to die. It is of little consequence, in view of our general fate, who dies first, especially as the Head of the Church has the keys of death, and consults the good of his cause when He so frequently opens the gates of death to the most devoted and useful of his servants. The corn of wheat that falls into the ground and dies, brings forth fruit. This memoir, we are persuaded, will greatly advance the missionary cause.

What a cause this is, which consumes so much treasure, calls for such sacrifices, separates earthly ties, and still, at the present moment, in view of all which it has cost, is more precious than ever to its friends! There must be something real and substantial in the object which is thus pursued. Visionary and romantic schemes are soon found out, and cease to delude their votaries. But the spirit of missions throughout Christendom is increasing in depth and strength.

Men and women, some of them the choice ones of Christian lands, are yearly baptized into this work for the dead. Times of commercial depression and disaster seem, at least in one instance, of late, to have increased the missionary fund. In the year 1837, remarkable for commercial distress, the contributions to the American Board amounted to $252,000, while in the previous year of general prosperity, they were only $176,000, being an increase of $76,000! Even sectarian divisions and separation of labor amongst its friends are swelling the amount of missionary effort; persecution in foreign lands scatters its influence only to increase it. In spite of every difficulty it holds on its way.

When we think of the heathen world groaning and travailing in pain together until now, and then consider the intention and efforts of Christians, with the help of God, to relieve them, it makes us think of the patriarch Jacob's dwelling in mourning and lamentation and woe, and Joseph's wagons standing at the door, waiting to make the mourning household partakers of the plenty of Egypt.

We are able, and, with the blessing of God, we intend, to pour into the heathen world an amount of consolation for its sorrows, joy for its sufferings, knowledge for its ignorance, cultivation and refinement for its barbarism, which, no benevolent mind can contemplate without earnest longings for its accomplishment.

Apart from the salvation of the soul, it is interesting to think what blessings we have it in our power to bestow upon the heathen and pagan world.

There is the bliss of virtuous, domestic relations, relief from bodily tortures, from human sacrifices, the establishment of humane institutions for the blind, the deaf and dumb, the sick and insane;—of which institutions, the pagan and heathen world contains not one original example. Useful knowledge, with the pleasure which its acquisition affords, as well as the practical benefits of it, is yet to be enjoyed by entire heathen nations; and the inhabitants of pagan countries are, by the influence of Christianity, to enjoy similar blessings, which their wise men, if they had the benevolence of the Christian religion, might now in some measure impart. Geography, natural history, astronomy, mineralogy, botany, writing, engraving, painting, the various arts of locomotion, with good roads and bridges, and the

innumerable inventions of the civilized world, are ready, as soon as the heathen tribes are prepared to receive them, to break upon them, like the successive works of God upon chaos, at creation. The blessings of good laws and just government await the pagan and heathen world.

The heathen world has this advantage, that, whereas we have spent centuries in inventing useful arts, they are to receive them disencumbered of the slow processes by which we arrived at them. They are to take our conclusions for premises, and with the impatient curiosity and activity of awakened mind, push on enquiry to further results. Sublime, no doubt, will be the scenes amongst them when the human mind awakes from its sleep of ages, and goes forth like Samson to shake itself, as in ancient times. It is an honor and privilege to live at this age of the world, when we can be instruments of this renovation.

It is interesting to look not only at the communicative nature of Christianity with respect to the diffusion of knowledge, but to the probable permanency of its influences, compared with that of ancient kingdoms. Take Egypt for an example. The wisdom of the Egyptians was proverbial, yet how little has the world profited by them. They were once the people, and their wisdom died with them. The world, instead of being taught by them, sends her wise men to spell out what they thought and said, from their hieroglyphs. Concerning the knowledge which these emblems were intended to impart, "Destruction and Death say, we have heard the same thereof with our ears." We think of Champollion in a mausoleum, lying on his back, far up under the roof, sketching the mystic signs. So passes the wisdom of this world which knew not God. Will any nation which receives and retains Christianity ever become a desert, and its places of sepultured grandeur echo to the foot-fall of the solitary and adventurous traveller, searching what, or what manner of time, the indentures of its caves and ruins indicate? We believe it to be impossible. Besides, increasing intercourse will keep the various portions of the world from stagnation and decay, as the currents and tides of ocean do its own ports. Those who assist in diffusing Christianity, we believe, are doing an imperishable work.

The Christian Church appreciates these things to a great extent, but not in their full importance. Some of the com-

plaints which we hear, and know to be felt, that no more is done, are good signs. They are like the sounds in the ice in spring, which indicate that the sun and streams are breaking up the bonds of winter. Seed time and harvest must come. Prophecy, like the vegetative power of the earth, cannot be restrained. The embarkation of every company of missionaries, the death of every servant of Christ on missionary ground, is a repeated assurance that there is a spirit of determination and of self-sacrifice, divinely inspired and guided, as we trust, which cannot fail to see its end accomplished.

Into this great work, the lamented subject of the memoir before us entered with her whole soul and strength. Her influence as a missionary, so far from being ended, is but just beginning. Great enterprizes when somewhat advanced, receive strength and excite enthusiasm, by the names and memoirs of their early founders. When the people for whose benefit the Syrian mission was established, begin to appreciate its efforts, they will revive its early history; the name and character of this missionary female will then be honorable and precious, and she will be to them a

———— "star of Arcady,
"Or" *Syrian* "Cynosure."—

Several things constitute Mrs. Smith a good example in the missionary work.

She entered the missionary service for life.

We have heard missionaries, who acted on this principle, say, that they had already experienced the "hundred fold in this life," according to the promise. All who are supremely devoted to this work, regard enlistment in it for life as essential to the highest happiness as well as to the greatest usefulness. It is a great means of posthumous influence for a missionary to die on the field of his labor. His tomb or head-stone, in coming years, will be moss-grown with hallowed associations. His bones will, in some spiritual sense, be like the bones of Elisha. A missionary who dies on his field, is like a plant that goes to seed on the spot where it grew, and scatters itself upon the wings of the wind. Christians at home associate his name with the martyrs. There is a canonizing disposition in the human mind. The names

and memories of the faithful are tutelar influences to pious feeling and sacred efforts. This law of social influence may be one reason why 'the death of his saints' is 'precious in the sight of the Lord.' We cannot think of the death of a missionary in his field of labor, otherwise than as a most appropriate and desirable termination of his course. It gives the friends of missions confidence in their work, adds moral power to appeals, excites respect for the cause in the community, to know and feel that missionaries are missionaries for life. But this is to be viewed rather as a privilege than as a duty. Efforts to recover health and to prolong life by a return to one's native land are obviously desirable and proper, and are not inconsistent with the general principle in question. Let us hear the opinion and feeling of Mrs. Smith upon this point.

"An enlistment for life, as a general thing, is quite essential to the permanence of this great enterprize. If I anticipated returning in seven years, I should be thinking more about that event, I fear, than I ought. Now I try to realize that this is my home for life; that here are all my interests. I do not wish to feel that I am a foreigner, but a denizen; and I hope to live, if it please God, to a good old age, among this people. p. 184.

She had a professional enthusiasm as a missionary.

Before she left her native land, her love for missionary work led her to disinterested labors among the Mohegan Indians. When she entered the foreign missionary service, she was like a ship that spreads every inch of canvass to the breeze, and shows that its impulse is felt through her entire frame. Illustrations of her enthusiastic love for her work occur on almost every page of her memoir. One fact will suffice as an example;—we refer to her earnestness in learning the Arabic language. She had no special taste for the study of languages. Her time was much occupied by her school. Her husband was her only teacher, and his labors prevented him from giving her much time in this instruction. She often wept at the difficulties she met with in acquiring the tongue, and would sometimes say in despair, that she should never learn it. There were excuses enough for relinquishing the study, had she been so disposed. But she was unwilling to live as a missionary amongst a people, and be ignorant of their language. This reason prevailed. In less than nine months after she learned the Arabic signs,

she began to pray in Arabic with the little girl whom she had taken into her family. In two months more she led in the devotional exercises of the native female prayer meeting. These efforts were extemporaneous. The last winter of her life, she began to translate an Arabic grammar, written in Arabic, (which had been her only written guide!) for the use of missionary females who might succeed her, hoping to make their task in acquiring this difficult tongue easier than her's had been.

The fact of her being without children of her own, gave her more time for her missionary studies and other labors. We refer, in these remarks, therefore, not so much to the amount of work accomplished by her as to her spirit as a missionary. She did not enter the missionary service merely as a wife. She was a missionary herself, and she makes this to appear in all her plans and conduct. She might have considered it enough to be the companion and the housekeeper of a missionary. She was a companion, indeed, and a most excellent housekeeper, but still she was a missionary, and a noble instance of energetic, resolute industry joined with the delicacy and sweetness of a true lady. For though, in her character as a missionary, she was like a tree that has roots of its own, yet as a wife and companion, she mingled her branches with those of the tree which had received her to its side; and they threw one shadow in that weary land.

But with all her enthusiasm as a missionary,

She was free from extravagant, radical views and feelings.

Her labors of love were joined with the patience of hope. She expected that when she had reached a good old age, she should see changes in the population around her. That this feeling was not the result of idleness, but of calm and sober views of the intrinsic difficulties of the missionary work, is evident from her incessant industry and exhausting labors. She was like a faithful husbandman that hath long patience for the latter rain.

We nowhere find in her writings impatient rebukes of the churches at home for their want of zeal. She gives us solemn and faithful admonitions and reproofs which no Christian mind can resist; but they are noiseless and impressive as the twilight. They make us think of our duty and of our neglect of it, and not of the irritation and fretfulness

of our reprover. Her manner, as in all cases, was the transcript of the heart. No great and permanent work can be accomplished with an irritable, impatient spirit. Mrs. Smith's spirit and manner in her work, remind us of what Foster says, in his Decision of Character, when speaking of Howard. She "had an equability of manner, which scarcely appeared to exceed the tone of a calm constancy, it was so totally the reverse of any thing like turbulence or agitation. It was the *calmness of an intensity* kept uniform by the nature of the human mind forbidding it to be more, and by the character of the individual forbidding it to be less."

She was remarkable for her private religious habits.

Incidental facts in her letters and journals and the remarks of Mr. Smith in his sketch of her character, present her to us in this respect as worthy of love and imitation. She made her circumstances yield to her desire to be alone with God. We see in her uniform habits of private prayer the secret of her devotedness to arduous and self denying labor, and of her uniform tone of religious feeling. Solitary prayer seems to have been her great and constant source of enjoyment since her conversion. She was not fully aware of the influence she was exerting by this means; for the good she accomplished is as much the result of her *being* good, as of her active employment. By the religious character she was thus assisted to form, as well as by the indirect influence of her private devotions, her Father who saw her in secret, is rewarding her openly.

Though in a land of exile, she conscientiously cherished the feelings and private observances of cultivated life.

We should infer from the history of her foreign residence, that, while abroad, she regarded every thing that affects the manners and character, as scrupulously as in her native land. She yielded to no neglectful spirit of indolence; she made order and beauty spring around her path; she did not degenerate, by comparative seclusion, in any of those things which, though trivial in themselves, greatly affect the moral feelings. Herbert says,

> 'Affect, in things about thee, cleanliness,
> 'That all may gladly board thee, as a flower.'

While the motive here offered, was necessarily weakened by the circumstances of her seclusion, we should infer from

the Life before us, that she aimed at the highest propriety in all her domestic arrangements, from principle, and for its effect upon her own character. She also cultivated a love for the works of God. In the midst of a shipwreck, the evening star, just sinking below the horizon, caught her eye, and gave her a sensation of hope. On the wild and precipitous places near Mount Lebanon the 'passion flower,' and the 'dragon's mouth,' attracted her observation.

> "Thus pleasures are spread through the earth,
> "In stray gifts, to be claimed by whoever shall find,"

and she kept her eye and heart open, and cherished the influence of a love of nature in refining and elevating the moral feelings. By this and other means, she is now exerting, through her published Life, an influence upon the cultivated part of the community, and 'them of reputation,' who are attracted by her good taste and refinement joined with ardent feelings. The memoir, we are happy to see, is extending its circulation amongst this part of the community. We cannot resist the reflection, in view of this: How important are the private habits, and the private hours of one who is placed in a situation of extensive usefulness. Their influence, as in the present case, may have no limits. It is a great thing to act in private and hidden life, upon high moral principle, and when no eye sees us, as well as at other times, to walk with God.

We are aware that we have spoken of the subject of this memoir with unqualified praise. To some it no doubt appears inexpedient ever to do so. We hope we shall do it, however, whenever we have as good an opportunity as the present. We think it cynical and evil-eyed to seek for detractions and qualifications in speaking of the good. Defects and sins, of course, they all have in their measure. We are for reversing the sentiment of the sly Mark Antony;—for it is also true that

> 'The' *good* 'that men do, lives after them,
> 'The' *evil* 'is often interred with their bones.'

We love to think of a certain example of praise, in the Bible, spoken of a man of like passions with us; "Hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him

in the earth; a perfect and upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil?" Just 'praise' is 'comely' to, as well as 'for, the upright.'

Mrs. Smith's private journal was lost in her shipwreck. We could better spare some lost manuscripts of much repute; for we believe that her journal contained invaluable records of her private religious life. We think that some have been whimsical in denouncing diaries, as written with an eye to publication. Suppose that they were? We should as soon think of urging this as an objection against keeping a log-book at sea. Others, who almost exclude the passive from Christian experience, and think little of meditative frames of mind, and affect a sort of smartness in their religious feelings, have no patience with these writings. We mourn over this degeneracy. Eminently good and useful Christians have had great conflicts in their private religious experience. Such things seem inseparable from eminent religious usefulness. 'Bread corn is bruised:' (Isa. 28: 28,) it is pleasant and profitable to see the process.

The portrait in this volume, we are told, is by no means a correct likeness. Another engraving is to be made from the excellent original portrait in her father's possession, and it is the wish of many of her friends that the purchasers of this volume may be supplied, gratuitously, with the new likeness, and substitute it, in the volume, for the present engraving.

In conclusion, we are constrained to say, as at the beginning, that we recollect no volume of biography which has affected us with so many delightful emotions. The early Christian experience, the supreme devotion to Christ, the disinterested and self-denying labors, the enthusiastic ardour in the missionary work, the calm and quiet energy, the extreme sensibility to all that is naturally beautiful and sublime, the composed and tranquil mind in perils by sea, the sadness and sorrow in the prospect of premature death, the sublime faith, the final joy, the involuntary music in death, of this Christian female, have excited in us no common feelings. We borrow a part of an old epitaph, with a slight alteration:

> "Death! ere thou takest" many a "wife,
> "Virtuous, fair, and good as she,
> "Christ shall launch a dart at thee."

ARTICLE IX.

Critical Notices.

1.—*Notes, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Genesis; designed as a general help to Biblical Reading and Instruction. By George Bush, Prof. of Heb. and Orient. Lit., N. Y. City University. In two volumes. Third Edition.* Andover and New-York: Gould, Newman and Saxton, 1839. pp. 364, 444.

We congratulate our readers on the completion of Prof. Bush's Commentary on Genesis, the first volume of which we have before noticed. We do not mean to say that this commentary is better adapted to popular use than any other, but we think that its author has formed a happy conception of what a commentary ought to be. We think that his work on Genesis exhibits the following excellences. (To say that it has some faults is only to say, it is a human production.)

First. *A clear exposition of the original text.* The first duty of a commentator is to express clearly the sense of his author. He must therefore have a correct and familiar knowledge of the language in which his author wrote; not a mere lexicographical knowledge, but an acquaintance with idioms, and a nice discernment of the variations in the *usus loquendi.* He must be able to trace analogies between words, to adduce parallelisms, and place the reader in the precise situation of those whom the author originally addressed. Prof. Bush has adopted the happy method of often giving at the outset the original Hebrew word or phrase with a *literal* version, and he confirms his rendering, when the case demands, by a copious citation of parallels. This process often precludes the necessity of an extended exposition, and puts the reader at once in the footsteps of an oriental. It thus in a measure supplies the place of an acquaintance with the original Hebrew.

Secondly. *A commendable fearlessness in meeting, and general success in solving, the difficulties of the sacred text.* Commentators often eschew the real difficulties, and wax mightily erudite and eloquent where there is nothing to trouble them. Not so Prof. Bush. He shuns nothing, shrinks from nothing, but marches up boldly to the *loci vexati.* Hence the reader

when harassed with the obscureness of the text is not vexed with evasions in his commentator, but finds a readiness to give solutions which seldom leave the mind so unsatisfied as they found it. The Professor is happy in his use of the ancient versions, and the Targums, and by means of them often puts his reader upon the right track of interpreting for himself.

Thirdly. *True judiciousness and candor.* He seems to know when to be diffuse and when to be brief; makes no display of learning for mere effect; does not mean to bring a "prejudicate sense" to the sacred volume, nor to sustain any pre-conceived system, but chooses to follow where inspiration leads, and to substantiate his assertions, as far as truth requires, by philological induction. Hence the reader is freed from suspicions that the commentary is to be made an instrument for party purposes, and to defend a favorite sect *per fas vel nefas.* Prof. Bush is not a sectarian expositor.

Fourthly. *Fulness and pertinency of illustration.* Our author has a good idea of the requisite furniture for a commentary, and hence avails himself of oriental sources of illustration, and makes travellers largely tributary to the explanation of costumes, manners, topography, etc. etc. His ideas are thus expressed with vividness and spirit.

Fifthly. The work is consequently well fitted to *arrest and confine attention.* Prof. Bush is very far from presenting the truths of Scripture in a *dry* light. He is evidently in love with his work, and writes *con amore;* he therefore diffuses an interest through his pages and allures the reader to further investigation. His quotations from the old English fathers are especially rich and attractive, and his work is so written as to be interesting in the perusal as well as useful for reference.

Sixthly. *Practical character.* The Notes are written with the recollection that "all truth is in order to goodness," and that the Bible is not a dead letter but is quick with spiritual vitality. There is a union of the exegetical with the ethical, and an ease and felicity in the introduction of practical remarks, which we are always glad to see. The German mode of severing the homiletic from the hermeneutic interpretation may be desirable for certain classes and at certain times, but is not the best adapted for popular benefit among churches like our own.

We think, on the whole, that Prof. Bush has adopted a happy medium for instructing and quickening the mass of mind in our religious community. We anticipate an exten-

sive and beneficial influence from his biblical labors, and cordially recommend his Notes on Genesis to ministers, theological students, teachers in Bible classes and Sabbath schools. We shall look with interest for the appearance of his commentary on the other books of the Old Testament, and we expect that his originality of conception, and his industrious research, will be the means of awakening a fresher and more general desire to investigate the meaning of the inspired text.

2.—*The Comprehensive Commentary on the Holy Bible. Edited by the Rev. William Jenks, D. D. of Boston. Published at Brattleborough, Vt., by the Brattleborough Typographic Company.*

This great work has been completed for several months, and we take this opportunity to give some account of its various and very useful contents. The plan of re-editing Henry's Exposition, in an abridged form, originated with John C. Holbrook, Esq., of Brattleborough, Vt., and was by him communicated to Drs. Jenks and Wisner of Boston. The latter, having engaged in his duties as one of the secretaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, did not engage actually in the enterprise. Dr. Jenks has had the sole general charge and responsibility. He has, however, received able assistance from several gentlemen, particularly from his son, Joseph W. Jenks, M. A., and the Rev. L. Ives Hoadley of Charlestown. Both are to be considered as joint editors with Dr. Jenks in the undertaking. It was soon agreed to combine with Henry's, Dr. Scott's admirable Commentary, as far as it was practicable. Much use has also been made of the labors of Vitringa, Lowth, Doddridge, Campbell, McKnight, Bloomfield, Kuinoel, Rosenmueller father and son, Whitby, Patrick, Adam Clarke, Stuart, and many others. The text, according to the common version, is first printed; then succeed the exposition of Henry abridged; Scott's observations condensed, and, finally, original and selected notes and illustrations from a great variety of sources, and of a critical, philological, topographical, geographical and practical character.

The work is completed, (not including the supplement), in five large octavo volumes of between five and six thousand pages in all. The reading matter is nearly equal to that in seventy common octavos of 450 pages each, which would have cost, at the common price, more than 150 dollars. The whole cost of bringing out the work, exclusive of paper, print-

ing and binding, has been about 50,000 dollars. On the whole, it has been one of the most expensive works ever published in this country, ranking in the same class in respect to the pecuniary outlay, with Brewster's Edinburgh Encyclopædia and Lieber's American Encyclopædia. The principal advantages of the publication may be stated as follows.

1. It has the pith and marrow of Henry. It presents the best thoughts of this prince of practical commentators in a compressed form. Most biblical readers have not the time to read Henry in its exuberant and diffuse original shape. It includes too much, as we may say, of a good thing. We are cloyed with the excessive sweetness. Besides, Henry deduces many thoughts from his texts, which do not legitimately flow from them. They are in a sense, additions to the word of God. They were not suggested by logical reasoning or fair inference, but by a prolific fancy. Henry's thoughts have been extracted and condensed, in the Comprehensive Commentary, as we believe, honestly and conscientiously. There could be, indeed, no motive for prevarication and deception. The original exposition is so multiplied among us, that the cheat could have been instantly detected.

2. We have many of the most valuable practical remarks, and not a few of the exegetical notes of Dr. Scott. This venerable Commentator was not accurately skilled in the original languages of the Scriptures. As a mere philological work, his commentary is very deficient. He was, however, a man of strong mind, of sound judgment, deep knowledge of human nature, of large experience in the Christian life, and firm in his attachment to the orthodox doctrines. Hence, his commentary, as a practical work, is unrivalled. It is full of experimental knowledge for the advanced Christian. Dr. Scott is always sober and in earnest. The editors of the Comprehensive Commentary have done well to copy largely from him. He has not the sententiousness or the lively terms of Henry; but neither has he the conceits, the prolixity, and the inconsequential reasonings which considerably mar the pages of Henry.

3. We attach great value to the more direct and original labors of Dr. Jenks and his coadjutors. The results of their investigations are not, indeed so prominent, being found mostly in the smallest type. They have condensed in a limited space much curious and important information, the fruits of learned study, and of extensive reading. Familiar use has been made of the great work on Egypt, prepared by the scientific and literary corps under the orders of Napoleon. The later

researches of the Champollions, of Rosellini, of Wilkinson, Lane, and others have not been lost sight of. Many of these illustrations were drawn directly from the original fountains, and they are of inestimable value. They sometimes cast light on the obscurest passages in the most difficult books of the Old Testament.

4. There is a great number of engravings on steel and wood. Some of these are very finely done, and greatly increase the interest and value of the work. The numerous maps and engravings will add materially to the worth of the volumes for Sabbath School teachers in the country, who cannot easily have access to large libraries or bookstores. Much use has been made by the editors of the plates, and pictures of Laborde, Porter, Wilkinson, Arundel, and of the excellent illustrations of the Bible by the Messrs. Finden, of London.

5. The editors have supplied a very valuable supplementary volume, which is nearly indispensable to the readers of the commentary. It comprises a new concordance to the Bible, with many illustrations on wood, a guide to the study of the Bible, embracing Evidences of Christianity, History of the Bible, Jewish Antiquities, Arts, Sciences, etc., being Carpenter's Biblical Companion condensed, biographical notices of nearly every author quoted in the Commentary, with copious lives of Henry, Scott and Doddridge, and a select list of biblical helps, an index to the Bible; Wemyss's Symbol Dictionary, Chronological and other Tables, and a complete and full index to the Comprehensive Commentary.

In conclusion, the editors and spirited publishers of this commentary have conferred, in our opinion, an inestimable service on the religious community by the wide diffusion of these six volumes. Thousands of families are thus put in possession, at a low rate, of a great amount of religious reading. The Commentary is, without doubt, imperfect. A carping criticism may delight to detect *maculæ*. The judicious biblical critic may demur at many of the exegetical observations of Henry and of others. Still, all candid and enlightened Christians will rejoice to know that the treasures of wisdom which flowed from the hearts and lips of such men as Henry, Scott and Doddridge are the possession, reverently examined morning and evening, at ten thousand firesides throughout the land.

3.—*Jahn's Biblical Archæology, translated from the Latin, with additions and corrections, by Thomas C. Upham, Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy, and of the Hebrew Language, in Bowdoin College. Fourth edition.* Andover: Gould, Newman and Saxton, 1839, pp. 573.

Three large editions of this work have been sold since 1823. The third edition was out of the market about two years since. The respected author, for many years Professor of Oriental Languages at Vienna, (born in 1750, died in 1816) was one of the most sober writers which Germany has produced. His learning, though not equal to that of some of his contemporaries, and of many men now living, was extensive and exact. Prof. Upham's version of the Archæology is one of the best specimens of a clear, simple and dignified translation which has yet been made from German authors. No work of the size will be more useful for Sabbath School teachers.

4.—*Gulielmi Gesenii Thesaurus Philologicus Criticus Linguæ Hebrææ et Chaldææ Veteris Testamenti. Tomi Secundi Fasciculus Primus.* Lipsiæ, 1839, pp. 278, qto.

This is the third number of the great Hebrew Thesaurus of Gesenius. The first part was published in 1829, the second in 1835. The fourth part is promised to be ready at the Easter Fair, in 1840. The work is now carried to the close of the letter Mem. The remainder will probably be completed in three parts. The last portion will contain some additions, particularly in relation to the first number, also four indexes, namely, a grammatical and analytical index, a Latin index, an index of helps, both of books and MSS., and an index of illustrated passages of the Scriptures. The whole work, when completed, will be an invaluable present to the Christian and the Oriental scholar. Each preceding part bears evidence of the industry, accuracy, and sound judgment of the author. Recourse is every where had, for the purposes of proof and illustration, to the most recent travellers, and Oriental investigation, to the labors of Rosselini, and to the other students of Egyptian antiquities, to the author's own Phœnician pursuits and to the results of the studies in the Indo-Germanic languages.

5.—*Die Heilige Schrift des alten und Neuen Testaments. Uebersetzt von Dr. W. M. L. De Wette. Dritte verbesserte Ausgabe Erster Theil, SS.* 527. *Zweiter Theil, SS.* 539.

The first edition of this translation was brought out in the year 1809—14, by the joint labors of De Wette and Augusti. The second edition, printed in 1831, was the work of De Wette alone, he having re-translated the portions which had been rendered by Augusti. The translation of Isaiah, however, was the excellent one of Gesenius, with a few slight alterations. The third edition, which is just completed, has been subjected to a fresh revision, and comes out in a very portable and handsome style. The notes, not very copious, are now printed at the end of the volumes respectively. They are almost invariably of a critical character, and are confined to the most difficult texts. The second volume includes a translation of the ten apocryphal books. Though we have no sympathy with many of the theological opinions of De Wette, yet his philological labors we very highly esteem. His translation of the Bible is the fruit of a long life of ardent and judicious study of the Bible. No German, perhaps, equals him in power to appreciate the beauties of the poetical parts of the Scriptures. He is perfectly ready to acknowledge the great merit of Luther's version, its astonishing influence on the German language, the modes and habits of thinking among the people, etc., while he maintains that many passages are not rendered correctly by Lutfer, and many others are susceptible of much improvement. A perfectly accurate translation of documents, so ancient as those of the Hebrew Scriptures, is not the work of one age or of one man.

6.—*The Last Days of the Saviour, or, History of the Lord's Passion, from the German of Olshausen. Mors Christi, Vita Mundi.* Boston : James Munroe & Co., 1839, pp. 248.

The Treatise, of which a translation is here given, is taken from the Commentary on the New Testament, by Prof. Hermann Olshausen of the University of Konigsberg, in Prussia. The original work is one of the most beautiful specimens of Commentary which has appeared from the orthodox Commentators of Germany. The author has a heart to feel, as well as a pen to delineate, in relation to the most stupendous and affecting event in the world's history. The version (we suppose by Mr. Osgood of Nashua, N. H.,) is remarkably idiomatic and fresh.

7.—*Xenophon's Memorabilia of Socrates, with English Notes by Alpheus S. Packard, Prof. of the Greek and Latin Languages and Literature, Bowdoin College.* Andover: Gould, Newman & Saxton, 1839, pp. 264.

Prof. Packard merits the gratitude of the literary and of the theological community for the rich presents which he is, from time to time, furnishing. The complete works of President Appleton was an invaluable offering to all who speak the English tongue. The Memorabilia of Xenophon is one of the precious treasures of the Greek Classics. It is here presented in an attractive and useful form, in a large and clear Greek type, accompanied with pertinent and somewhat copious English notes. The text is substantially that published by Weigelius at Leipsic, in 1819, under the superintendence of Prof. G. H. Schæfer. The editions of Weiske, Bornemann and Dindorf have been diligently compared. We have no doubt that many of our institutions will follow the example of Bowdoin and Union Colleges, in adopting this edition of the Memorabilia of Xenophon as one of their text books.

8.—*Lectures on the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, by Thomas Chalmers, D. D., and L L D.* Glasgow, vol. I. 1837, pp. 450, vol. II. 1838, pp. 428, vol. III. 1839.

These Lectures of Dr. Chalmers, are plain and practical, designed for the mass of common readers of the Bible. They are the record of his Sabbath preparations for many years. They were delivered, as it would seem, when he was minister of the Tron Church in Glasgow. Though not finished and elaborate performances, yet they may be read with much pleasure and advantage. The genius of the great theologian will break out occasionally, in spite, as it were, of himself. Dr. Chalmers cannot cover up his idiosyncrasies. No man's intellectual framework is more strongly marked. No one adheres more tenaciously to his peculiarities of style and manner. We have been exceedingly interested to see how such a man, surrounded by the terrors of Scotch orthodoxy, would get over the *locos vexatissimos* of Rom. v., vii., and ix. Had we space, we would enrich our pages with his comments on two or three passages.

9.—*An Exposition of the Second Epistle of Peter. By the Rev. Thomas Adams, Rector of St. Gregory's, London, A. D.* 1633. *Revised and corrected by James Sherman, Minister of Surrey Chapel, London.* Holdsworth, Paternoster Row, London, 1839, roy. 8vo. pp. 899.

This is a remarkable work;—remarkable for the richness, originality, and force of intellect it displays, remarkable also from the fact of its having remained so long a hidden treasure, seldom found on the shelves of libraries or on the pages of catalogues. But it carries within itself its license to live, and it is now by the labors and enterprize of Editor and Publishers put beyond the reach of a second oblivion. As far as Mr. Sherman may desire any reward beyond what he enjoys in the thought of having conferred a lasting favor upon every class of theologians and philo-Biblists, he may doubtless promise himself a kind of *secondary immortality*, an *appended perpetuity*, to his own name in connection with that which he has thus happily lifted out of a long and undeserved obscurity.

Every lover of Scripture, expounded almost in the very spirit of its authors, is familiar with the worth of Leighton's golden comment on the *First* Epistle of Peter. In the exposition of Adams on the *Second*, we have a monument of equal, though differing talent, eloquence, unction, and all the other attributes of a head and heart of the rarest endowments. Of the author little is known, except that he was an Episcopalian in discipline, though a Puritan in faith and spirit, and that after laboring for forty years in Bedfordshire, he removed to London, where he continued preaching and publishing for several years longer, closing and crowning all his works with this masterly Exposition of Peter, in 1633. Though distinguished by the quaintness which was the fashion of the times, it is a surprising specimen of mental wealth and ministerial diligence, exhibiting as many thoughts in as few words as are to be found in the English, or perhaps any other language. Even Sallust himself is not more distinguished for the epigrammatic pith of his sentences. His acquaintance with Scripture is extensive and minute, and the felicity with which he brings one truth to illustrate another is scarcely to be paralleled. His quaint and punning style no doubt diminishes at this day somewhat the effect of his general excellence as an expositor, but the reader cannot but be penetrated with the conviction, which must have rested on the minds of his hearers, not only of his abilities and diligence, but of the immense labor he must have bestowed to bring all his resources

to bear on this book. The consequence must have been a fixed attention and deep impression of the importance of a correct understanding of the sacred oracles. But as all our remarks will fail to convey an adequate notion of the work, we insert the following as a slight specimen of the author's style:—"The creatures are constrained to minister to the wicked desires of sinful men. The sun was fain to lend his light to those pagan monsters, while they committed their most execrable rapes and murders. The moon waits on the thief, while he acts his robbery. The stars hide not their aspects from atheistical astrologers. The winds, with prosperous gales, fill the sails of pirates. On the lands of oppressors the clouds let fall their fructifying burdens. Viands make fat the epicure; and wine is ready for the unnatural thirst of the drunkard. Herbs and minerals are medicinal to the unholiest bodies. Jewels and precious stones shine on the proud. Birds are compelled to part with their feathers to stuff the bed of uncleanness. They are all forced to serve them that do not serve God. This is the bondage under which they groan, and from which they labor to be delivered, longing for the time when all these things shall be dissolved."

10.—*An Exposition of the Prophet Ezekiel, with useful observations thereupon. Delivered in several Lectures in London, by William Greenhill, M. A., Rector of Stepney, and Chaplain to the Dukes of York and Gloucester, and the Lady Henrietta Maria, A. D.*, 1650. *Revised and corrected by James Sherman, Minister of Surrey Chapel.* London: Samuel Holdsworth, 1839. roy. 8vo. pp. 859. Daniel Appleton, New-York.

Mr. Sherman, the industrious Editor of Adams, abovementioned, has laid the religious world under a fresh obligation by the reprint of this valuable relic of Puritan talent, learning and unction. It is got up in the same beautiful style of typography with the former, and destined to take its place on the same shelf. We cheerfully accord to the Editor not only the meed of our gratitude for the service performed, but of our cordial respect for the liberality of spirit which has allowed him to see sufficient merit in the works of one of the little handful of Independents in the Westminster Assembly, to engage his efforts to rescue them from oblivion. We have no doubt that equal treasures remain yet to be dug out of the same mine, and if we could flatter ourselves that these remarks would ever reach the eye of Mr. S., we would earnestly

solicit his attention to the works of Greenhill's associate in the Stepney Lectures, the Rev. Jeremiah Burroughs. The style of his Discourses, most of which were Expository, is more homely, from his apparently aiming at a less cultivated class of hearers, than that of most of his compeers; and he has moreover a larger mass of merely temporary and local allusions, intermingled with matter of general, or rather of universal interest, but for originality and richness of thought, for felicity of illustration, and for a tact of educing the most striking practical applications of Scripture, we consider him absolutely unrivalled. We have the testimony of Flavel that few men in England were ever more blessed in their labors, though he died at the age of forty-three, of a broken heart in view of the troubles and distractions of the church in the times in which he lived. His works, together with the choicer Treatises of Thomas Goodwin, and Caryl on Job, after being submitted to a judicious modernizing revisal, we yet hope to see reproduced for the benefit of the living generation of Christian men and ministers. They will serve at least as a perpetual fountain from which to transfuse the quickening streams of *practical* inference into the more predominantly *critical* commentaries demanded by the exigency of our times.

But to return to Greenhill. His exposition of the Prophecy of Ezekiel was delivered in Lectures in the city of London, and originally printed, a volume at a time, as a few chapters were concluded, till five small quarto volumes completed the Exposition. These were ever after held in the highest repute, but they gradually became scarce, and so difficult did it at length become to obtain a perfect set, that one has been known to have been sold at the enormous price of from seven to ten pounds sterling. The last volume became particularly rare, from its having been, as is supposed, destroyed in the calamitous fire of London, in 1666. The whole is reprinted in the present edition complete.

The style of the work is in a great measure that of the age. It is characterised by the Editor as abrupt, not always chaste, often imperfect, and full of singularities; yet searching, bold, striking, and effective. His method of exposition is to go as fully into the literal meaning of his author as the critical furniture of his day would allow, and after settling the import of the Hebrew terms, which are copiously interspersed through his pages, to lay out 'the beginning of his strength, upon the pertinent and spirit-searching observations which he would point to the inmost hearts of his readers. It would doubtless be too much to expect of any commentator of that age a lucid

and satisfactory exegesis of the dark things of Ezekiel's prophecy. Indeed the obscurities of that book continue still to defy the enucleating sagacity of Christian, as it has ever done, of Jewish, critics; yet the Lectures of Greenhill are full of edification, and to use one of his quaint allusions, if the reader finds the strong meat of the literal sense *too* strong for his spiritual digestion, he can betake himself to the milk of the observations.

11.—*A Grammar of the Idioms of the Greek Language of the New Testament. By Dr. George Benedict Winer, Professor of Theology in the University at Leipsic. Translated by J. H. Agnew and O. G. Ebbeke.* Philadelphia: Herman Hooker, 1840. pp. 469.

Some months since we announced the proposed Translation of Winer's Grammar, etc., by Professors Agnew and Ebbeke. The work now appears, with the unqualified recommendation of Professors Stuart, McLelland, Hodge, Sears, Nevin, Mayer and Schmucker, prefixed. It is an octavo volume, and as far as we are able to judge, from a cursory examination, is sufficiently well executed.

Any one acquainted with the obstacles in the way of translating the German into smooth and correct English, and who will cast his eye over the pages of this book, and observe the almost numberless references and quotations which it contains, will at once perceive that the Translators have performed a work of great labor and difficulty. We trust it will be found, (on a more thorough examination than we are able at present to give it,) to have been accomplished in a manner at once worthy of their character as accurate scholars, and satisfactory to the numerous students of the New Testament to whom the laborious investigations and extensive researches of Dr. Winer are thus rendered available.

Among those who have had access to this work in the German, and who are qualified to judge, we have heard but one opinion expressed of its superlative excellence. Prof. Stuart says, "There is nothing like it. It is, beyond all question, a *nonpareil* of its kind." Dr. Hodge remarks, that it "is not properly a Grammar," but a "*Grammatical Commentary* on the New Testament;—a work of the highest authority and usefulness."

The following remarks of the Translators, which we copy from their preface, contain a candid and satisfactory notice of the author and his work.

"Dr. Winer commenced his labors in this department some twenty-five years ago, and soon after published a small Grammar, translated in 1825, by Professors Stuart and Robinson. At the time of the original publication he was *Professor Extraordinary* at Leipsic, his native city. In 1823 he became *Ordinary Professor* of Theology in the University of Erlangen, Bavaria, and on the death of Tittmann, in 1832, he was recalled to Leipsic to supply his place, where he remains at present attracting crowds to his Lectures. He is the giant of the Theological faculty at Leipsic, as Hermann is in the Classical.

The volume now offered to the American scholar is the fourth and last edition (1836) of Winer's Grammar of the New Testament Idioms, and may be regarded as almost perfect in its line. * * * An examination of its pages will prove that it surpasses any thing published in the English language in the department of New Testament philology, and that it will be an invaluable auxiliary to the Theological student. The general classical scholar also will find it full of interest, both in its numerous references to ancient authors, and in its copious illustrations of grammatical principles in their application to the Greek language of classical writers. There is a constant comparison, on all points, of the κοινὴ διάλεκτος with the language of the New Testament in its syntactic rules."

12.—*An Address delivered in South Hadley, Mass., July 24th, 1839, at the Second Anniversary of the Mount Holyoke Female Seminary. By Rufus Anderson, D. D. Published by request of the Trustees*, pp. 24. Boston: Perkins and Marvin, 1839.

This is a valuable pamphlet. The author has not attempted a discussion of the principles which ought to control the arrangements and methods of female education. He has rather chosen to look calmly on the swelling and movement of the public mind on this subject, and endeavored from the history of that movement for the last thirty years and from its present aspects to form some reasonable anticipations of what the future may be. No man is better fitted than Dr. Anderson to contemplate such a subject with close and dispassionate scrutiny, or to educe from shifting and uncertain appearances, probable surmises of far remote results. While the past and the present offer little that can satisfy, in this respect, the desires of the judicious friends of that sex, he sees the future full of hope. We join in his hope, and are cheered by his assurance.

We fully sympathise with the noble doctrine, ably set forth in this address, that the field of every man and of every woman's labor is the world. But we would guard against perversion and abuse of the doctrine. Our labors are thus widely and eternally operative, because, under the wise government of God, we are parts of a vast system, in which every moral act in any the humblest soul is felt to the remotest boundary as surely as the falling of a drop into the ocean moves the whole mighty mass of waters. We are not so by our own choice. Our own volition cannot make us more or less so. A power mightier than we entering through our multiplied relations into our feeble acts gives them this wider, this infinite diffusion. The same power, by the same means thwarts and disappoints our largest and wisest schemes. They who have toiled for immortality were laid in their graves, and forgotten in a day, and now no trace of them and of their great works can be found. Systems laboriously piled up to work the world's weal or woe have shrunken and withered as in a night. While the poor and despised, working solitary and apart, and knowing nothing of the spirit that was in him, has achieved a labor that lives in the daily life of men, or put the first hand to an impulse whose waves are yet circling the globe. We would not discourage any man from acting on this lofty view of universal good. But because that good is not easily measured by our conceptions of it, and a false conception may lead to fanaticism, we would have men remember that God makes our acts long and broad, not we—that our sphere is narrow, and we must look well to its narrow interests, for little as they may be, the world cannot well get on without them. While he looks widely around to refresh him, and gain strength, he must again and ever stoop to his hourly toil.

A true education for the world, in our view of the arrangement of Providence, is that which prepares every one to work for good, humbly and quietly and obscurely if need be, but contentedly to work somewhat, in the faith that Providence, out of the fragments we furnish, will make a harmonious whole. As in doing this work from our complex nature, we must, and rightfully and innocently may, act from many principles, so in education, must these principles be appealed to, that they may act strongly in future life. The sphere of woman is eminently laborious, and always domestic. Let her be trained for home, and her influence shall go out through all the world.

We cannot leave this discourse without bestowing our most hearty commendation on the chaste and transparent style in which it is written. Though the doctrine is deep, the expres-

sion is always clear. It is exact, business-like, and forcible. Such a production from such a man, ought to do much to check the prurience of fine writing that is unhappily too prevalent among us.

13.—*On the Relation between the Holy Scriptures, and some parts of Geological Science. By John Pye Smith, D. D., F. G. S., Divinity Tutor in the Protestant Dissenting College at Homerton.* London: Jackson & Walford. 1839. 8vo. pp. 439.

The distinguished author of the "Scripture Testimony to the Messiah" here appears in a new field. The recent demonstrations made by the science of Geology, have created, it is well known, no little alarm among good men lest its allegations and conclusions should invalidate the testimony of revelation. We cannot doubt that the discussions, by Professors Hitchcock, Stuart and Pond, in the previous Volumes of the Repository, and from which Dr. Smith draws very largely in the volume before us, have done much to remove the fear of any ill-omened antagonism between the records written by the pen of Moses on 'goat-skins and sheep-skins,' and those inscribed 'by the finger of God on tables of stone,' dug out of the bowels of the earth. Still it may be admitted that something further was wanted to present the argument in all its strength; to give in a full, yet perspicuous form, as little encumbered as possible by scientific technicalities, the reasons which have led geologists, while professing a reverential regard for Scripture, to assign to our globe such a vastly higher antiquity than the letter of the Mosaic narrative seems to ascribe to it. This work we are happy to say is most ably achieved in the volume before us. The great desideratum so extensively felt is here most happily supplied. Such a view of the whole subject is exhibited as could be exhibited by no one who did not combine in himself, in very unwonted measure, the knowledge of philology and of physics. Without professing to be in the strictest sense of the terms a *practical geologist*, with which his literary avocations are clearly incompatible, he yet shews himself completely master of geology as a science, and appears to be as familiarly conversant with rocks, strata, drifts, conglomerates, detritus, rolled pebbles, bowlders, and all the technics of the science, as if he had never labored at all in the field of criticism and theology. He has evidently explored the whole region of research, as far as its recorded results have enabled him, and he appears

in this work carrying the torch of revelation down into the deep caverns and clefts which the lamp of science had disclosed, and illuminating, with a brighter light, the foundations of the everlasting mountains.'

The consequence is, that while he yields an unhesitating assent to the most stupendous conclusions of the modern geology, and in fact states their evidence in a new and intensely interesting light, he finds no conflict between them and the Mosaic records fairly and rationally interpreted; and by *rationally* we mean simply in accordance with that sound and enlightened reason which God has given us, the only medium of correctly understanding his word. After two lectures on the origin, design, and importance of geological science; the requisites and methods of study; the harmony of all science with revelation; the description of facts relative to the crust of the earth; its internal condition, stratified formations, and organic remains; he enters upon the recital of opinions which are by many assumed to be asserted or implied in the Scriptures, but which are contrary to geological doctrines. Of these he specifies, (1.) The recent creation of the earth. (2.) A previous universal chaos over the earth. (3.) The creation of the heavenly bodies after that of the earth. (4.) The derivation of all vegetables and animals from one centre of creation. (5.) That the inferior animals were not subject to death till after the fall. (6.) The ascription of the grander geological phenomena to the deluge. All these positions he alleges to be erroneous, and proceeds to set them aside by a course of reasoning which no one can fail to admit to be of most masterly character, whatever effect it may have upon his convictions. He then enters upon an examination of the various methods which have been proposed for the removal of the difficulties and alleged contradictions between geology and Scripture. Of these he mentions, (1.) The denial of any difficulty, by shutting the eyes to the evidence of geological facts, and representing the inquiry as impious. (2.) Sacrificing the Mosaic records as unintelligible, or as being the language of mythic poetry. (3.) Regarding the six days as designed to represent indefinite periods. (4.) Attributing stratification and other geological phenomena to the interval between the Adamic creation and the deluge, and the action of the diluvial waters.

He then proceeds to consider the forms of language used in Scripture to convey to man a knowledge both of the Deity and his works, and thence to deduce a general law of interpretation to be applied to the narrative of the creation, which leads

him into an extended critical exposition of the first chapter of Genesis. The grand principle, which he defends as conclusive and as absolutely indispensable for maintaining the honor of the word of God, is, that the revelations contained in the Scriptures in respect to God and his works were conveyed *in representations to the senses*, chiefly that of *sight*, and *in words descriptive* of those representations. Consequently it is the usage of the sacred writers *to speak of the Deity, his nature, his perfections, his purposes, his operations, in language borrowed from the bodily and mental constitution of man, and from those opinions concerning the works of God in the natural world, which were generally received by the people to whom the revelation was granted.* From this principle as an axiom the author argues, that as the Scripture references to *natural objects* would be in such style as *comported with the knowledge of the age in which they were delivered*, so at the present time we are fully warranted to *translate* the language of the Old Testament upon physical subjects into such modern expressions as shall be *agreeable to the reality of the things spoken of.*

But we must here close our notice of this very valuable volume. After all we have said of its contents, the reader will have but an imperfect idea of the amount of interest and information which it embodies. But by way of amends for the meagreness of our sketch, we are happy to announce that an immediate reprint in this country is under consideration, and that the work will probably soon be presented to the American public.

14.—*Lectures on Biblical Criticism, exhibiting a Systematic View of that Science. By Samuel Davidson, LL. D., Professor of Biblical Literature, in the Royal Academical Institution, Belfast.* Edinburgh: Thomas Clark, 1839. 8vo. pp. 411.

The high gratification we feel in noticing the appearance of this able work is mingled with regret that we can at present do no more *than* simply to notice it. The more ample and elaborate review which it merits it can scarcely fail eventually to receive. Mr. Davidson's name has been hitherto unknown among us in the walks of biblical literature, but from the sample which he has here given of his ability to fill with distinguished repute the department which he occupies in the Belfast Institution, we cannot but draw the happiest omens of his future achievements in the same sphere. The sternest

republican can scarcely be offended with the epithet 'royal' when he finds it attached to an institute which gives scope to labors and researches like those embodied in the present volume. The field which Mr. Davidson here enters with so firm a tread and so manly a bearing is one that has been hitherto for the most part occupied by the German literati, and though we would not detract aught from the just award of their labors which they have so zealously put forth in this department of sacred letters, yet we rejoice to perceive that they are not to be left as its sole occupants and cultivators. Every one acquainted with the idiosyncrasies of German genius is aware that it shows a continual tendency to spend its energies in settling the *letter* of revelation rather than disclosing its *spirit;* or in other words, a tendency to exalt *criticism* above *hermeneutics.* Our author brings altogether another temper to his work. Although he undertakes not to erect his edifice without a scaffold, yet he does not busy himself so much about the scaffold as to forget that he has an edifice to erect; which the German is very apt to do.

The various topics embraced in Mr. D.'s volume are treated in such a way as to shew that instead of servilely copying from copyists, he has gone to the sources of authority, and examined and judged for himself. The reader will accordingly find in these pages a *real advance* in the science of biblical criticism. The whole field of Manuscripts, Versions, Editions, Readings, Quotations, etc. etc., in fine, whatever constitutes the *res critica* of revelation, is explored with a diligence and discrimination entitled to the highest applause. His reasonings and results are conveyed in a lively and spirited style, at the farthest possible remove from the dry, abstract, barren prosings which usually distinguish treatises of this nature. In the midst of so much that is satisfactory and excellent it were not easy to specify the more attractive parts, but we cannot refrain from pointing to the chapter on the 'Nature of the Hebrew Language,' as remarkable for the original and luminous views it exhibits of the structure and genius of that ancient tongue. In his chapter 'on the Greek Article,' he enters into an elaborate vindication of Middleton's doctrine on that subject in which he comes in collision with the views of Prof. Stuart, expressed in former numbers of the Repository. Although somewhat free in his strictures on the Professor's positions, yet he is throughout abundant in indications of his great respect for the value of his labors in the province of sacred literature.

15.—*Job and his Times ; or a Picture of the Patriarchal Age, during the period between Noah and Abraham, as regards the state of Religion and Morality, Arts and Sciences, Manners and Customs, etc., and a New Version of that most ancient Poem, accompanied with Notes and Dissertations. By Thomas Wemyss, author of 'Biblical Gleanings,' 'Symbolical Dictionary,' and other works.* London : Jackson & Walford. 1839. 8vo. pp. 382.

Whether as a version or a commentary, the title of this work is somewhat unique; yet as illustrating the history and biography of a Scripture personage it is strictly appropriate. The design of the author is not only to throw out all the most distinguished lights and shadows of Job's character and experience, but to introduce the reader to patriarchal scenes; to familiarize him with the manners, customs, arts, and sciences of that early period of society. The object is certainly a good one, for a correct knowledge of the meaning of any ancient author can usually be obtained only by a knowledge of his times. The interest and fascination thrown around these primal ages is almost universally felt, yet our actual acquaintance with them is but limited, being gleaned from detached materials scattered here and there through the Scriptures. These, however, Mr. Wemyss has detected with singular acuteness, and seized with the avidity of one who has found great spoil. To give some idea of the result of his researches in this department, we insert a part of his table of contents;—the mechanical art ; the military art ; modes of travelling ; of hunting ; of writing ; mining operations; precious stones; coins ; process of refining ; musical instruments ; cosmology ; astronomy ; meteorology ; aurora borealis ; volcanoes ; vegetable productions ; zoology, behemoth and leviathan ; judicial proceedings.

Under these several heads the author has brought together a great deal of curious and interesting matter. As a sample of it we may refer to that entitled 'Aurora Borealis,' in respect to which the reader is naturally prompted to enquire what allusion is contained in the book of Job to a phenomenon which has been supposed to be of comparatively recent occurrence. Such an allusion the author shows to be recognized by the great mass of interpreters in ch. 37. 22, 'Fair weather cometh out of the north,' where the original word for 'fair weather' signifies, in its primary sense, *gold ;* and in a secondary sense *any thing resembling gold in color and lustre.* Mr. W. supposes accordingly that the term refers to those radient streams

or flashes of golden light which constitute this splendid spectacle.

The author discovers great diligence in his researches, and much ingenuity in advocating his views of particular texts, though the critical apparatus which he has actually used seems to have been confined in great measure to English commentators. His list of writers on Job contains indeed the mention of some of the principal modern German critics, but we doubt whether he is very familiar with this source of illustration.

The famous passage ch. 19. 25—27, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," etc., he regards on the whole as *not* referring to the Messiah, but to God as his future Deliverer and Vindicator on earth. He supposes that the expression "whom I shall see for myself," etc. was fulfilled afterwards when he exclaimed, ch. 42. 5, 'I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now *mine eye seeth thee*,' etc. We cannot profess ourselves convinced of the correctness of his views of this passage, yet we freely admit that much of his reasoning upon it, is very difficult to dispose of. The subject merits an investigation, which we hope ere long to present to our readers in the pages of the Repository.

Taken as a whole, the 'Life and Times of Job' forms a valuable accession to the growing stock of our sound biblical literature, and we trust that a volume so well entitled to a place in every theological library will not be long in finding a publisher in our own country.

16.—*The Parent's Friend; a Manual of Domestic Instruction and Discipline. By John Morison, D. D., author of 'Counsels to a newly-wedded Pair,' etc. etc. etc.; with a Prefatory Address to Parents in America; by Samuel Hanson Cox, D. D.* New-York: Gould, Newman and Saxton. 1839. 18mo. pp. 172.

This is an age of 'Friends,' both to young and old, to parents and children, to teachers and pupils, to young men and maidens, and happy should we be to affirm that they were all as well entitled to the name as the little volume that here comes with its gentle and unobtrusive proffers of counsels to fathers and mothers. We must feel grateful to the intermediate agency, which at this season of gift-making to the young, has provided so fitting a present for the parental hands which have just emptied themselves of their annual mementos of love and duty to their children.

With but humble pretensions, this little treatise can still

scarcely fail to win its way to the acceptance and confidence and growing estimation of those for whose use it has been so considerately prepared. It comes forward as an exceedingly well-timed assistant to the discharge of the hallowed functions of those whom God hath 'set in families.' Within the most convenient compass it embodies a really large mass of *sound and sanctified good sense* on the various topics of which it treats. It is seasonable, suitable, practical, adapted, as it is intended, to *befriend* parents who are to educate their children for heaven. As a *vade mecum*, replete with hints, principles, suggestions, cautions, rules, encouragements, we cannot conceive of any Christian father or mother who would not be enriched by its possession. The position of the author in the midst of a splendid city population gives him peculiar advantages for estimating and portraying the evil influences which beset parental exertion from that source, and enable him to speak as an instructed monitor on the gaieties, modishness, and follies that under a specious guise war against the soul.

The Prefatory Address of the American Editor is in the happiest vein, and we cannot perhaps speak in more laudatory terms of the volume itself than to say that it is worthy of such an exordium. No one on reading the whole will find that there is any want of keeping between the rich preludium and the brief but pithy sequel.

17.—*The School Library, published under the sanction of the Massachusetts Board of Education.*

This enterprize is one of momentous consequences. A judicious selection of books, which are to constitute a large part of the reading of the children, and we may add of the parents too of a State,—a selection made with a discriminating literary taste, an accurate apprehension of the wants of the community, and a regard to sound principles of religion and morality may be not only one of the strongest influences in elevating the poor and informing the ignorant; but by raising the general standard of thought and of attainment, may raise the whole body of the people insensibly but surely to higher degrees of refinement and cultivation. The greatness of the scheme seems to have been fully appreciated by the framers of it; and they have carefully guarded against any abuse of the vast powers which have been committed to their hands.

A large portion of the works which are to constitute this library are to be original productions by men of well known literary and scientific character, made expressly for this col-

lection; or standard works revised by responsible and suitable persons, and adapted, by whatever changes may be necessary, to the purposes of it. Those of the first kind will probably be the largest number. Every book, before it can occupy a place in the Library, must be approved by each member of the Board of Education, gentlemen who are elected to that place, with regard to their taste, their knowledge of the people, their acquaintance with the business of education, and their sound discretion. The names of those gentlemen are a sufficient guaranty that no unworthy volume will be offered to the public. The names of the gentlemen whose pens have been engaged to prepare different works for this collection are another and sufficient guaranty. We notice among them that Dr. Robley Dunglison is to prepare two volumes on Human Physiology; Prof. Silliman, one or more on Chemistry; Prof. Olmsted, a popular treatise on Astronomy; Dr. Jacob Bigelow, two on the Useful Arts; Judge Story, one on the Constitution of the United States; etc. etc. etc.

The Library when complete is to consist of two series, of fifty volumes each, one in 18mo. of 250 to 280 pages a volume; the other in 12mo. of 350 to 400 pages. One of them is to be a *juvenile* series. Ten volumes (more perhaps, but we are not aware of it,) have been published. These are the Life of Columbus, by Washington Irving, revised by him and enlarged for this edition; Paley's Natural Theology in two volumes, with wood cuts, and Selected Notes from Brougham and others, arranged by Dr. Elisha Bartlett; three volumes of Lives of Eminent Individuals, celebrated in American History, with portraits; these are selected from Sparks' American Biography; The Sacred Philosophy of the Seasons, by Rev. Henry Duncan, of Scotland, edited, in four volumes, by Rev. F. W P. Greenwood of Boston. These works are clearly of great value. Placed in the hands of intelligent youth, they will impart knowledge and kindle thought, and stimulate inquiry. They will make labor and thrift intelligent. They will aid every effort that is made in any way and any where, to elevate the moral and social character of our people.

In looking over these volumes we were struck with the singularly infelicitous account given in his Life of Vane, by Rev. Mr. Upham, of the doctrinal faith of Mrs. Hutchinson. No one who understands the spirit, and especially the theological spirit of New England in her day, and who has studied the documentary evidence in the case, could easily, we think, imagine that her doctrine of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost was just modern Unitarianism, an indwelling of the moral

virtues. Such blemishes may here and there perhaps be detected, but they do not materially impair the value of the whole.

There is one defect, which some may consider an excellency, in the plan of the Board. All works more directly religious, than those which treat of morals and of natural theology are excluded. We fear that the state of public sentiment in Massachusetts is such as to require it. Yet we cannot but believe and hope that the dread of sectarianism will ere long be found to have been officious in this thing, and that men will bear to have their children read works of theology which may not in every respect harmonize with their own judgments. We regret to have it so gravely implied that party differences in religion are so fierce among us.

The publication of this library is the serious enterprize of a state, guarded, ordered, and controlled by the best wisdom of the state. We know of no similar collection, that can be compared with it, for pureness and for valuable information. It is published under the superintendence of the Board, by Marsh, Capen, Lyon and Webb, 109 Washington-street, Boston.

18.—*The School District Library, published by Harper and Brothers, 82 Cliff-street, New-York:—embracing History, Voyages and Travels, Biography, Natural History, the Physical Sciences, Agriculture, Manufactures, Arts, Commerce, Belles Letters, the History and Philosophy of Education, etc.*

The preceding notice of the "*School Library*," published under the sanction of the Massachusetts Board of Education, has been furnished us by a literary friend in that state, in whose good sense and accurate discrimination, on such a subject, we have the highest confidence. We have therefore inserted it with pleasure, and would commend it to the careful attention of our readers. The enterprise is highly creditable to the state, and to the individuals who have commenced it.

Such a notice, however, of the laudable endeavors of Massachusetts to enlarge and elevate the sphere of Common-school Instruction, reminds us that it may be our duty to advert, in connection with it, to the progress of a similar enterprise in another state. "*The School District Library*," by Messrs. Harper and Brothers, of New-York, has been for some time before the public. Their first preparation of a School Library was commenced as early as 1835, and embraced

a *first and second series*, of from ten to twenty volumes each. Since that time they have much enlarged and improved their plan. The Library now embraced under the general title given at the head of this notice consists of a *First Series*, of *fifty* volumes, and a *Second Series*, of *forty-five* volumes, already printed and bound in a neat and uniform style, and a *Third Series*, now in the progress of publication.

It appears to have been the aim of these enterprizing publishers to adapt their preparation to the recent provision of the state for the improvement of Common Schools. This provision appropriates to each school district a sum sufficient for the purchase of a library, more or less extensive. They have sought also and obtained the counsel of the Superintendant of Common Schools, of the State, (at present the Hon. John C. Spencer,) and his able advisers. The *first and second series* are accordingly accompanied by the unqualified recommendation of that gentleman, whose character and ample qualifications to judge on such a subject will give to his opinions great influence with the Trustees and Commissioners of Common Schools throughout the State.

Here then is another endeavor to provide for the reading of the mass of the population embraced in the school districts of an immense Commonwealth. This endeavor, however it may have originated, has become, like that of Massachusetts, "the serious enterprise of a State," through its constituted officers for such purposes. We agree with our correspondent in contemplating it as an enterprise of momentous consequences. It proposes to itself a duty of the highest responsibility and the greatest difficulty. It ought therefore to be stimulated by an energy adequate to its full accomplishment, and guarded by all the salutary checks of sound discretion and practical morality.

The object of such an enterprise should be to provide such books as are adapted by the variety and interest of their topics and the style in which they are discussed, to allure the people to the pursuit of knowledge, and which shall, at the same time, inculcate and enforce the principles of the Christian religion. It is not enough that we exclude from the Libraries, procured for our School districts, books which avow and defend infidel and irreligious principles. Nothing should be retained that is, in this respect, even equivocal. It is time that this were understood by politicians, and publishers, as well as by the Christian ministry. It is believed by the most intelligent and sagacious among us, of all professions, that the only security for the permanent continuance of a healthy state

of morals in any community is in the religious principles of the people. Every department of Education, therefore, should be adapted to the inculcation of truth;—not scientific and intellectual truth only, but religious truth, which is in harmony with all the truths of nature and of science, and without which the best developments of the human mind can never be attained.

We have not ourselves compared the laws of Massachusetts and New-York, in regard to the securities which they afford for the procuring of School Libraries of the best moral tendency. Of one thing, however, we feel assured. It is that that library will ultimately be preferred and will secure to itself the most lasting success, which conforms with the most firmness and decision to the principles above stated. The books in all these libraries which lay claim to the public patronage must be examined and tried by these principles. It is the duty of the periodical press thus to try them, and for ourselves we hope not to be remiss in this duty. It is a *Christian* literature for which we propose to labor, in all the departments of education, from the common school to the highest seminary of learning. Not that we desire to see every book written *about* religion. But as the goodness of God pervades all his works and ways, so would we have piety towards him pervade all our learning. Nor would we plead for a *sectarian* literature. We will join hands with sober minded Christian men of all classes in the promotion of intelligence and virtue.

We confess that we are not prepared to express an opinion of all the books contained in "*Harper's School District Library.*" We have been favored with the possession of only a very few of them, as they appear in these series. A catalogue of their subjects and authors only is before us. Most of these are familiar to us, as among the most instructive and useful books in our language for juvenile and even for adult reading. The selection, as a whole, appears to be judiciously chosen and well adapted to the object proposed. We name the following as among the *ninety-five* volumes which constitute the first and second series;—Life of Washington, by J. K. Paulding, Esq.,—American History, by the author of American Popular Lessons;—American Revolution, by B. B. Thatcher, Esq.;—The Principles of Physiology, etc., by Dr. Combe;—Celestial Scenery, etc., by Dr. Dick;—Palestine, or the Holy Land, by Rev. Dr. Russell;—Improvement of Society, etc., by Dr. Dick;—The Philosophy of the Moral Feelings, by Abercrombe;—Life and Works of Dr. Franklin;—The Farmer's Instructor, by the late Judge Buel;—The Pursuit of Know-

ledge under Difficulties, etc.;—Tytler & Nares' Universal History, in six volumes;—Paley's Natural Theology, with Notes by Brougham and Bell, edited by Rev. Dr. Potter;—Ten volumes of Sparks' American Biography;—Goldsmith's History of Greece, prepared by an American Author;—Familiar Illustrations of Natural Philosophy, by Prof. Renwick;—Elements of Geology, by Dr. C. A. Lee;—Goldsmith's History of Rome;—Chaptal's Chemistry;—Dwight's Lives of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence;—Plutarch's Lives, in four volumes.

Among the books announced for the third series, are Hale's History of the United States;—Selections from the Writings of Washington;—Dick on the Starry Heavens, etc.;—A Treatise on the Constitution of the United States;—Biographies of Distinguished Females;—Prof. Upham on Imperfect and Disordered Mental Action, etc. etc.

These are but a portion of the works of acknowledged excellence, for popular use, embraced in these selections. They are sufficient to indicate the general character and tendency of the whole, and to awaken the most encouraging anticipations of the general usefulness of these successive series of books, on a great variety of topics, selected and prepared with a view to the wants of the community, and adapted to a universal diffusion in our country.

We shall turn our attention to these series of publications hereafter, and shall thankfully receive suggestions from the experience and observation of our enlightened correspondents. It is a matter which deeply concerns us all to see that the books which are to constitute the reading of the nation be such as shall exert a healthful influence upon the minds of the people. And it should be borne in mind that the selections now made and in preparation under the sanction of the organs of the States of New-York and Massachusetts, will not be confined to those states. If wisely made, and discreetly and intelligently adapted to the objects in view, they will be adopted by the guardians of education and the friends of improvement in every state in the Union.

19.—*Dictionary of Latin Synonymes, for the use of Schools and Private Students, with a Complete Index. By Lewis Ramshorn. From the German by Francis Lieber.* Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown. 1839. pp. 475.

The author of this work, Dr. Ramshorn, is a distinguished philologist and a practical teacher in Germany. It is an

abridgment of a much larger work, in which the author avails himself of the works of Gardin—Dumesnil and Ernesti, and which is entitled "Universal Latin Synonymes." This abridgment now translated into English and adapted to our Schools and Colleges, will supply a want which has long been felt by those who instruct in Latin. Few works could be offered, either to the instructor or the Student, more welcome than this. The translator has done his part with accuracy and ability, making such additions as seemed necessary to secure the most exact expression in English of the peculiar shade of the Latin terms;—and the publishers have executed the work in a neat and economical form, making it available to students of limited means. We value it highly as a help to the accurate perception of the precise meaning of Latin terms and phrases, and shall often refer to it as such. It is a book which every scholar, who possesses it, will find occasion to use.

20.—*Letters to the Rev. Professor Stuart, comprising Remarks on his Essay on Sin, published in the American Biblical Repository for April and July*, 1839. *By Daniel Dana, D. D. Minister of the Gospel in Newburyport.* Boston: 1839. pp. 46.

This pamphlet has quite recently fallen into our hands. We have read it with more than ordinary care and interest both from our respect for the author and because it is a reply to an Article, by a writer equally respected in our own publication. We may add also that this reply was prepared for the Repository, and we would gladly have inserted the substance of it, had not the author chosen to give it a form, and to embrace in it some personal considerations addressed to Prof. Stuart, which were judged to be a departure from the usages of our work. On these accounts the application for its insertion in the Repository was withdrawn, and its separate publication adopted as better suited to meet the convenience, and answer the objects of the respected author.

In regard to the considerations of a merely personal bearing, in these Letters, we intentionally abstain from any remarks. It is to be regretted that the discussion of important principles in the Christian system may not always be conducted apart from all implication of personal dereliction or of official inconsistency. Such considerations tend to no profitable progress in discussions whose object is truth on the grounds of evidence and argument. They are neither evidence nor argument, and rather hinder than advance the establishment of the truth.

The style of Dr. Dana is chaste and courteous. The cursory reader of these Letters will be impressed with the kindness and urbanity of the writer. In this respect his example is worthy of imitation.

Of the conclusiveness of our author's arguments we are not ambitious to express an opinion. The Letters are before the public, and the essay which they controvert is accessible in our own publication. He who reads the former should also avail himself of the latter, if he would understand the real strength of the positions of the parties. We make this last remark, because, to us, it is apparent that some of the most important positions of the Essay are misapprehended in the Letters. Much of the strength of Dr. Dana, therefore, is expended in defending doctrines which Prof. Stuart equally defends, and in opposing positions which he does not assume. For example, (p. 4.) "The object of your Essay seems to be, to disprove and explode the *doctrine* of original sin, or of native depravity," etc. Again: "Your *denial* of the doctrine of original sin," etc. Now, if we rightly understand Prof. S., he does not *deny* the *doctrine* of original sin, as it is understood by its intelligent defenders; but maintains that the *phraseology* in which that doctrine has commonly been expressed is improper. He declares it as his firm conviction, that "The parties agree as to every important fact in the case," and the grand question which he raises and discusses is this: "Do the Scriptures recognise, and ought we to adopt the *phraseology* of original sin, either imputed or inherent!" There are other statements in the Letters which we think equally conflict with those which are found in the Essay, and which seem to have led the author of the former away from the true points of the discussion. Though it is not our intention, therefore, at present, to take part in this discussion, we would again recommend that the Letters and the Essay be read in connection.

21.—*Fraternal appeal to the American Churches, with a Plan for Catholic Union, on Apostolic Principles. By S. S. Schmucker, D. D. Professor of Christian Theology in the Theol. Sem. of the Lutheran Church, Gettysburg, Pa., Second Edition, enlarged.* New-York: Taylor and Dodd, 1839. pp. 165.

The readers of the former series of the Repository will recollect that the substance of this "Appeal" appeared first in the pages of this work, in 1838. By the recommendation

of numerous Clergymen and others of different denominations, a large edition of it was published a few months since. We are glad to see a second and enlarged edition before the public. It is an evidence that the truly Catholic views and spirit which it inculcates do not slumber in the churches. We trust the time is not far distant when they will be more justly appreciated and universally embraced. They should be seriously and prayerfully pondered by all who pray for the coming of the kingdom of God in the earth.

22.—*Memoir of the Rev. Edward D. Griffin, D. D. Compiled chiefly from his own writings. By William B. Sprague, D. D. Albany.* New-York: Taylor and Dodd, 1839. pp. 270. Octavo.

The Memoir and Sermons of Dr. Griffin, in two volumes, were noticed in the Repository for July last. The memoir is now published in a separate volume, and in a form which we trust will be acceptable to the numerous personal friends and admirers of that great man. It is accompanied with an engraved likeness of Dr. Griffin, which is deservedly admired as remarkably accurate and characteristic.

23.—*The Trial of Jesus before Caiaphas and Pilate, being a Refutation of Mr. Salvador's Chapter entitled "The Trial and Condemnation of Jesus." By M. Dupin, Advocate and Doctor of Laws. Translated from the French by a Member of the American Bar.* Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1839. pp. 96. 12mo.

We have read this little volume with great interest. It places a familiar subject in the clearest and most convincing light before the mind. Salvador, in a work on the "Institutions of Moses and the Hebrew People," published a few years since, expresses the opinion that the trial and condemnation of Jesus, considered merely as a *legal proceeding*, was conformable to the Jewish laws. M. Dupin, who is one of the most eminent lawyers of the French Bar, immediately called in question the correctness of this opinion. The volume whose title is given above, is the result of his examination, conducted with great legal skill and extensive learning. We commend it to our readers. Both the Christian teacher and the disciple will derive instruction from its perusal.

24.—*The Theatre, in its influence upon Literature, Morals and Religion. By Robert Turnbull, Pastor of the Boylston-street Church, Boston. Second Edition.* Boston: Gould, Kendall and Lincoln, 1839. pp. 110.

The substance of this treatise was prepared and delivered as a discourse before the young men of Hartford, Connecticut, when a measure in favor of Theatres was pending before the Legislature of that State. It is a lively and pointed discussion of the subject, and a deservedly popular little volume.

ADDITIONAL NOTICES.

Several other books are on hand, which we have not room even to name in this No. of the Repository. They will be noticed hereafter.

Barnes' Notes on Isaiah, in three volumes, have just made their appearance, and will doubtless be read with interest.

The following books are on our table: The "*Philosophy of Human Life*," etc. By Amos Dean, Prof. of Medical Jurisprudence in the Albany Medical College; *Pictures of early life; or sketches of youth*. By Mrs. Emma C. Embury; both from the press of Marsh, Capen, Lyon and Webb: Boston. *The Museum of Religious Knowledge, designed to illustrate Religious Truth*. Edited by Marcus E. Cross, Published by J. Whetham, Philadelphia, and Robert Carter, New-York.

We hear with pleasure that the Syntax of Dr. Nordheimer's Hebrew Grammar is now nearly completed, and will in the course of the winter be put to press. So far as our information extends, it will fully meet the high expectations which the public are entitled to entertain from the character of the first volume.

ERRATA.

Page		
25.	14th. line,	for "I had occas'on," read had occasion.
27.	6th. line,	for "Jiedi" read Jedy.
"	12th. line,	for "el 'Akobah," read at el 'Akabah.
"	17th. line,	for "alt." read. at.
"	37th. line,	for "el Jed i," read. el Jeth.
28.	6th. line,	for "el-Teth," read. el Teth.
"	14th. line,	for "descent," read. ascent.
126.	15th. line,	for "by," read, as.
129.	24th. line,	for "no proof," read, no small proof.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

A NEW PROPOSITION.

THE terms on which the Am. Bib. Repository is now supplied to subscribers, who receive it by mail, are acknowledged by all to be exceedingly liberal. Many new subscribers have accordingly been obtained who could not afford to pay the former price of the work. It has been suggested, however, that the number might be still farther increased and thus the usefulness of the work promoted, by the following proposition.

The proprietor accordingly proposes, and *hereby agrees*, that, to any and every subscriber to the Repository, he will allow ONE DOLLAR for each *new* subscriber he will procure (and forward pay for the same according to the printed terms on the cover,) during the current year! Are there not a thousand present subscribers who will forward each an additional name? Will not many of the number exert themselves to procure each, at least, *three*, or *four*, or *five new* names, and thus save to themselves or their friends the price of their own subscriptions?

Communications (postage paid) will be promptly attended to, and the Nos. will be addressed to new subscribers as they shall be desired.

As this proposition is made principally to gentlemen who already possess the work, and know its value, nothing need be added here in commendation of its character and worth. Many families and intelligent gentlemen of other professions and callings, as well as Clergymen, have found themselves amply rewarded by the possession of a miscellany of so rich and various instruction. Subscribers are respectfully and earnestly requested to co-operate in commending the work to all who ought to possess it. W. R. P.

P. S. After the present No. the 12mo edition will be printed on better paper.

PROSPECTUS.

WILLIAM R. PETERS, No. 89 Nassau-street, New-York, proposes to publish, (if sufficient encouragement shall be obtained,) a new Periodical, to be denominated

THE

ECLECTIC:

OR THE

AMERICAN SELECTER

OF

FOREIGN PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

CONDUCTED

By ABSALOM PETERS, D. D.

Editor of the American Biblical Repository,

AIDED BY AN ASSOCIATION OF LITERARY AND PROFESSIONAL GENTLEMEN.

The design of this Publication will be to present to American readers, in the most economical and available form, most of what is truly excellent on the great variety of topics and discussions which constitute the current Periodical Literature of all Foreign countries. It will be compiled from a selection of the best articles and passages in the most important Foreign Quarterlies and other Periodicals, Literary, Scientific, Political, Religious, Biblical, Theological, Historical, Geographical, Philosophical, Mechanical, Philological, Critical and Professional. Articles and passages thus selected will be accompanied, when judged to be necessary, with Editorial remarks, introductory and explanatory, to put the reader in possession of the occasion, progress and bearings of each discussion and topic of research.

The Periodical publications in Great Britain and on the Continent of Europe are quite too numerous and expensive to be within the reach of American readers, excepting where they are accumulated in the Libraries of wealthy Societies and Institutions. An individual can seldom avai himself of more than one or two of the number; and these are often

found to be of a local, or sectarian, or party character, and afford him but a very partial and inadequate view of the current general literature of the old world. And even if the whole were accessible by each individual of our intelligent countrymen, the readers of Foreign Periodicals need not be told that the mass of what they contain is light and trifling, or prosing and dull, or local and sectarian, or of bad moral tendency, or, at least, irrelevant to the pursuits of American citizens and scholars.

The indiscriminate circulation, therefore, in this country, of Foreign Periodicals, should be deprecated as an evil. The best of them are scarcely worthy of being reprinted entire for American readers; because much of what they contain is on common-place topics, (perhaps better understood by ourselves,) and is second rate in point of talent and research, and not worthy to take the place of our own more able discussions. But many of the works referred to contain much that is truly valuable, much that surpasses the productions of our own writers on the same or similar topics. It would seem indispensable, therefore, if we would avail ourselves of the best advantages to be derived from the Periodical literature of all Foreign countries, that some plan be adopted to select and preserve the good "and cast the bad away." Such a plan the Editor proposes to adopt in conducting the Eclectic.

It cannot be doubted that, from materials so ample and excellent as exist in the mass of Foreign Periodicals, a work may be compiled which will be worthy of a place in the current reading of every educated family, and in the library of every American scholar.

This work, while it will exclude what is trifling or pernicious, will be the advocate of no particular school or class of views in any of its departments. Of disputed questions, it will present the most able and thorough discussions on both sides, but will not assume the advocacy of either. On every topic to which it shall be extended, its object will be to furnish the reader with the best materials for the formation of his own opinions. By a strict adherence to these principles, the Editor and his associates hope to make a compilation from the mass of Foreign Literature, which will be equally acceptable to scholars and liberal-minded men of all professions.

It may be hoped, also, that a work, conducted on these principles, with suitable care and research, exhibiting only the best specimens of thought and expression to be gleaned from the field of the Foreign Periodicals, will exert an important influence in elevating the tone and character of our own Literature. As far as our writers are ambitious to imitate the style of the Foreign Journals and Reviews, it is important that they be furnished with the best models.

On the whole, therefore, it cannot be doubted that the plan here proposed, if well executed and sufficiently encouraged, will furnish a facility, which could be attained in no other way so well, to the correct understanding of the most important and interesting topics and discussions which constitute the whole progressive world of Foreign Literature, Science and Art.

This Prospectus is issued, not with the absolute assurance that the plan proposed will be adequately encouraged.

The work will not be commenced until a sufficient number of subscribers shall have been obtained to ensure its support. Its plan is, therefore, respectfully submitted to our numerous readers and correspondents, and to the friends, in general, of a sober, practical, elevated and instructive American Literature.

It is hoped that sufficient encouragement will be afforded to justify the publication of the first No. of the Work, early in July next, so that one Volume may be completed within the current year.

If commenced, it will be issued bi-monthly, on the first days of July, September, November, January, March and May, making six Nos. a year, of 204 pages each, and two Volumes of more than 600 pages each. It will be printed in the type of this prospectus, on an enlarged page, and the amount of reading will be nearly double that of the American Biblical Repository, and other Original Five Dollar Quarterlies.

The price will be Five Dollars per annum, *in advance*, or Six Dollars, if delayed till after the delivery of the second No.

No payments are desired until the result of this appeal shall have been fully ascertained. Then, if the work is un-

dertaken, bills will be forwarded to subscribers with the first No.

Communications, *postage paid*, will be gratefully received. and the names of subscribers will be recorded, with a view to the commencement of the Work as soon as practicable.

Every subscriber will be allowed One Dollar on his own subscription, for each additional subscriber he will procure, and for which he will become responsible.

Subscribers are respectfully requested to forward their names, without unnecessary delay.

P. S. The Editorial Association will consist of gentlemen belonging to the different professions, who will give special attention to the departments with which they are most familiar, while the principal Editor will be responsible for the general character and variety of the work.

New-York, April 1., 1840.

ORIENTAL TYPE.

It gives us pleasure to inform our readers, that one of the greatest difficulties under which American scholars have heretofore labored in the cultivation of the Oriental Languages, especially the cognate dialects of the Hebrew, is now likely to be removed.

Hitherto the necessary elementary works could not be procured, unless by importing them at an enormous expense from Germany; for however we might possess scholars capable of preparing suitable Grammars, Lexicons and Chrestomathies to these tongues, there have been nowhere, except at Andover and New Haven, the requisite facilities for publishing them. In New-York, it was scarcely possible, within a very short period, to have even a few words or sentences set up in decent Hebrew type. But this reproach is now rolled away.

Through the enterprise of Mr. J. F. Trow, one of our most accomplished printers, New-York may boast of the richest fonts of Oriental Type, of the most exquisite model, to be found on this side of the Atlantic.

From the celebrated foundry of Tauchnitz in Leipsic he has imported an ample assortment in the various languages embraced in the accompanying specimen, viz., the Greek, Hebrew, Samaritan, Ethiopic, Syriac and Arabic, and is prepared to execute works requiring these varieties of letter to any extent. To many of the readers of the Repository we presume we could not well present a more interesting or attractive page.

SPECIMEN.

Greek.

Ταῦτα ὀρθῶς μὲν ἐκεῖνος εἶπε πρὸς τοὺς μεθ' ἑαυτὸν στρατηγοὺς, οἷς παροδον ἐπὶ τὰς ὕστερον πράξεις ἔδωκεν ἐξελάσας τὸν βάρβαρον, καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐλευθερώσας.

Hebrew.

Long Primer.

וּסְרַתּוּ אִמּוֹ׃ מַה־בְּרִי וּמַה־בַּר־בִּטְנִי וּמֶה בַּר־נִדָּרָי׃ אַל־תִּתֵּן לַנָּשִׁים חֵילֶךָ
וְדַרְכֶיךָ לְמְחוֹת מְלָכִין׃ אַל לַמְּלָכִים׀ לְמוּאֵל אַל לַמְּלָכִים שְׁתוֹ־יָיִן וּלְרוֹזְנִים
אֵו שֵׁכָר׃ פֶּן־יִשְׁתֶּה וְיִשְׁכַּח מֻחָקָק וְיַשַּׁנֶּה דִּין כָּל־בְּנֵי־עֹנִי׃

Pica.

אֲדוֹן עוֹלָם אֲשֶׁר מָלַךְ בְּטֶרֶם כָּל יְצִיר נִבְרָא׃ לְעֵת נַעֲשָׂה בְּחֶפְצוֹ
ל כֻּלָּא מֶלֶךְ שְׁמוֹ נִקְרָא׃ וְאַחֲרֵי כִּכְלוֹת הַכֹּל לְבַדּוֹ יִמְלוֹךְ נוֹרָא׃
וְהוּא הָיָה וְהוּא הֹוֶה וְהוּא יִהְיֶה בְּתִפְאָרָה׃

Samaritan.

ֲׁשֵׁשׁ׃ ֲׁשֵׁשׁ׃ ֲׁשֵׁשׁ׃ ֲׁשֵׁשׁ׃ ֲׁשֵׁשׁ׃
ֲׁשֵׁשׁ׃ ֲׁשֵׁשׁ׃ ֲׁשֵׁשׁ׃ ֲׁשֵׁשׁ׃ ֲׁשֵׁשׁ׃
ֲׁשֵׁשׁ׃ ֲׁשֵׁשׁ׃ ֲׁשֵׁשׁ׃ ֲׁשֵׁשׁ׃ ֲׁשֵׁשׁ׃

Ethiopic.

ወተካዘ: ዮናስ: ሀበዮ: ት ካዘ: ወሐዘሃ:: ወጸለዮ:
ኀበ: እግዚአብ ሔር: ወይቤ: እግዚኦ: አኮ ፃ: ነፍሰ:
እቤ: በብሔ ርዮ: ወበእኀተ: ዝሰቱ: ተኀ ጣእኩ: ተርሴስ:
እስመ: አአምር: ነሰ: መሐሪ: እ ፃተ: ወመስተሀሣል:

Syriac.

ܨܒܘ ܐܚܢ ܡܢܗܘ ܕܐܫܬ ܟܫܝܫ ܠܐ ܡܢ
ܫܘܠܡܐ: ܘܡ ܒ ܥܘܒ ܒ ܒܘܠ ܒ ܥܒܕܐ
ܒ ܐܚܬܐ ܒ ܥܒܕܐ ܒ ܒܘܠ ܒ ܫܒܚܘܗܝ.

Arabic.

أَحَدٍ حَتَّى يَقُولَا إِنَّمَا نَحْنُ فِتْنَةٌ فَلَا تَكْفُرْ فَيَتَعَلَّمُونَ
مِنْهُمَا مَا يُفَرِّقُونَ بِهِ بَيْنَ ٱلْمَرْءِ وَزَوْجِهِ وَمَا هُم بِضَارِّينَ
بِهِ مِنْ أَحَدٍ إِلَّا بِإِذْنِ ٱللَّهِ وَيَتَعَلَّمُونَ مَا يَضُرُّهُمْ وَلَا

THE

AMERICAN

BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

APRIL, 1840.

SECOND SERIES, NO. VI.—WHOLE NO. XXXVIII.

ARTICLE I.

Religious Prejudices.

By Philip Lindsley, D. D. President of Nashville University, Nashville, Tennessee.

Sir William Jones, at the commencement of an essay, in which he proposes to draw a parallel between the gods of the Indian and European heathens, makes the following liberal preliminary remark: "I shall remember that nothing is less favorable to inquiries after truth than a systematical spirit: and shall call to mind the saying of a Hindu writer, 'that whoever obstinately adheres to any set of opinions may bring himself to believe that the freshest sandal wood is a flame of fire.'"

To rise above vulgar prejudices, is generally esteemed an evidence of an enlightened and superior mind. If by this, nothing more were meant, than a rejection of error for the sake of truth, or an honest disposition to seek and to embrace truth to the utter renunciation of error, in defiance of all our previous opinions and habits, we should not object to the position. Such a determination, if rigidly adhered to, does certainly evince much candor of temper and strength of intellect. But if the declaimers against vulgar prejudices, expect us to be divested of every prejudice before we can be qualified for the fair investigation of truth or for its reception, we humbly conceive that they quite overshoot the mark,

by making a demand on poor human nature which it neither can nor ought to yield. All men have prejudices. They imbibe them unconsciously and imperceptibly from the first moments in which impressions are made on the senses from any causes.

Prejudice is a prejudgment—or a judgment formed beforehand, without examination—an anticipation of knowledge—a preconceived opinion—or an opinion embraced without proof, or, at least, before the mind has ever comprehended the proof which supports it.

The majority of every man's sentiments and principles may, with much propriety, be denominated prejudices. He has received them from his parents, from his nurse, from his teachers, from his associates, from accidental circumstances, from the peculiarity of his position and rank in society, from the particular form of government and religion of his country, from partial reading, and from all those numerous and nameless causes and influences which give variety to life, and which impart a specific coloring to every man's character and destiny. Many of these prejudices are doubtless good and well-founded, though we may never trouble ourselves at all about the foundation on which they rest. The mass of mankind, in every country, are actuated and governed by their prejudices. They neither reflect nor reason for themselves. If their prejudices happen to be correct, they generally prove orderly and useful citizens or subjects. And we certainly feel no desire to interrupt the tranquillity of such virtuous well-meaning persons, by suggesting a single doubt, or by throwing a single difficulty in their way. Let them live and die under the salutary influence of prejudice. Let the Laplander love his freezing snows, and the African his burning sun. It is a happy prejudice which inclines him to prefer his dreary native regions to every other country. Were it not for this prejudice, this invincible *amor patriæ*, half the globe would be destitute of inhabitants. It is therefore an innocent and very beneficial prejudice. This is one instance. Many more of a similar kind might be mentioned. Happy would it be for the human family were all their prejudices equally harmless. Happy if their prejudices on subjects of deep and lasting moment were always in favor of truth.

But the fact is far otherwise. The ten thousand totally dissimilar and contradictory political and religious systems

which prevail in the world, and which command the affections of men, incontestably prove that the prejudices of the far greater proportion of our race are erroneous. These prejudices, too, are inveterate. It is scarcely possible to eradicate them from the minds of any considerable number. And it is always dangerous to attack the prejudices of the multitude in an open and direct manner. Such an attack generally tends to bind them more strongly to their errors: or if it should produce an opposite effect, the consequences are oftentimes much more deplorable. This is eminently the case with regard to religious prejudices. The falsest views and notions of religion are better than none. Without the fear of God, in some form, operating on the mind and conscience of men, human laws become nugatory, and society is at an end. Witness France—so often cited on similar occasions—soon after the commencement of her revolutionary tumults. Her ignorant volatile people were so powerfully wrought upon by the disguised enemies of truth, that they were at length induced to trample in the dust the entire fabric which papal tyranny and superstition had erected among them, to burst in sunder the chains by which they had been for ages fettered, and to rush into all the extravagancies of atheistic licentiousness. No substitute was offered them for the absurdities of a religion which they so hastily abandoned. The result was natural, and might have been anticipated. Every benevolent oppugner of popular religious prejudice will proceed with cautious steps; and endeavor to give at least an equivalent—something true and salutary—for what is false and mischievous. Otherwise he had better be content to let prejudice reign undisturbed.

These hasty and desultory remarks we have thought proper to premise as illustrative of the subject generally. We profess not, however, to be the advocates of prejudice any further than the welfare of society and the frailty of our nature seem to render unavoidable. The ignorant multitude are, and necessarily must be, under its dominion. Let them therefore be excused, and pass without censure or rebuke.

But can we extend the same indulgence to men who claim the distinction of scholars—of free inquirers after truth, —who, notwithstanding their superior opportunities, and their high pretensions to science and liberality, do yet entertain partial and bigoted sentiments on any subject which

they profess to have investigated, and which they certainly might have investigated to its very foundations and throughout all its bearings and connexions? Is it not the prerogative of science to dispel error, to remove prejudice or to convert what was once prejudice, into certain knowledge or indisputable truth, by a lucid development of the evidence on which it rests? But when she fails to produce this effect in her votaries—when even the comparatively enlightened favored few, who affect to despise the ignoble vulgar, evince an uncandid, dogmatical, opinionative spirit, an obstinate adherence to tenets which they have adopted, they cannot tell whence or wherefore—what can be reasonably urged in their defence or justification? Or what benefit do they derive from science, if their minds be not sufficiently enlarged and liberalized to qualify and dispose them to look into their own hearts, and to scrutinize the opinions and doctrines which they may have been accustomed to cherish as indubitable or as innate verities?

We do not mean to insinuate that a man, in order to become truly learned upon any subject, ought forthwith to renounce all his previously acquired ideas of that subject—to become, as it were, a *tabula rasa*—that he may be enabled to proceed dispassionately and without bias, till he shall arrive at truth by fair demonstration or induction. We would not reduce him to a state of infancy with a view to rectify the obliquities of premature manhood. This would be impossible. But we ask him to exercise his reason in subjecting to a legitimate test the materials already stored in his mind. We ask him to be ready to give the proof of what he professes to believe. And not like mere children to appeal to the authority of parents and teachers, or like orthodox Romanists, who believe because the church believes. We ask him to venture beyond the bare *ipse dixit* of philosopher or priest or favorite author, and to learn why his master has taught him thus, or why this particular creed or system has been imposed on his mind and incorporated with his feelings rather than another. We ask him, in a word, to be open to conviction. Not to become a skeptic in order to escape delusion.

When a man has once reached this point, he is in a fair way to discover truth and cordially to embrace it. He may then be said to have begun to be divested of prejudice. He

is prepared to canvass systems and opinions which had once been his aversion; to give a candid hearing to men and parties which all his early habits and notions had led him to oppose and despise. Names no longer alarm him, however odious they may be to the particular party or sect or denomination with which birth and education may have connected him. It is truth, under whatever guise or name she appears, that he is now in search of. Such a man is liberal, forbearing, tolerant, generous, independent, just and modest. He never condemns hastily, nor without adequate cause. And if his researches shall have made him acquainted with the Bible—as they necessarily would, if he have the happiness to live in a Protestant Christian country—we may then behold in him an edifying example of what is so rarely to be met with—a truly charitable man. In the Bible he finds truth, pure and unadulterated, substantial and cheering to the soul. Before its celestial light, all his religious prejudices vanish away. And his faith is settled, as upon a rock, never more to be shaken.

But why then are not all Christians of one mind and of one faith? Why do they not, at least, live together in the exercise of love and mutual forbearance? If charity be the essential pervading attribute of our holy religion; should we not expect that her friends would be friends to one another? Should we not expect, moreover, that much unanimity of sentiment would obtain among men who derive their notions or doctrines from one and the same source? This, we think, might reasonably have been anticipated. For we certainly should never have conjectured, previously to a knowledge of the fact, that so many discordant opinions as are entertained in the Christian world, could ever have claimed a shadow of support from the great charter of a religion so pre-eminently gracious and benevolent in its nature and object. Strange that so many inconsistencies should exist in a book, the avowed design and tendency of which are so plain and obvious that even the most illiterate may readily understand and obey its precepts. Strange that the Holy Scriptures, the volume of inspiration, the only unerring guide to mortals through this world of darkness, sin and trial, the only revelation ever vouchsafed by the infinitely wise and good Jehovah to his creatures—strange, inconceivably strange, that the work of such a Being, and given for so great and so

kind a purpose, could be fairly construed or even plausibly perverted so as to countenance the multiform, absurd, pernicious, and contradictory dogmas which have been ascribed to it or extorted from it.

We must believe that a revelation from God could not be justly obnoxious to such variety of constructions: otherwise we take from it all certainty and all value. Its grand paramount object must be something definite, unequivocal and explicit. If then the Bible does contain a revelation of the Divine will—and that it does, all the contending parties agree—it necessarily follows that its main scope and design must be clear and precise, and altogether above the misconception of any candid mind. But were we to judge of the gospel exclusively from the conduct and writings of very many Christian doctors and divines, we should be apt to conclude that it consisted of some antiquated collection of ambiguous, metaphorical, mysterious, oracular, enigmatical phrases and sentences—similar to the far famed Sibylline verses—which had been purposely contrived or accidentally arranged, to bewilder and perplex the human intellect, and to defy all rational interpretation. And yet, we feel assured, that the gospel is light; and that, like its glorious Author, in it there is no darkness at all. It unfolds to us a system of morals and a plan of salvation, which, however depraved ingenuity may misrepresent or reckless impiety assail and asperse it, cannot fail to command the reverence, and to meet the wants and fears and hopes of the humble, the ingenuous and the devout.

It becomes then a matter of some curiosity at least, to inquire whence such various and conflicting opinions have arisen with respect to its doctrines and provisions; and why these still continue to be held by honest and dishonest, learned and unlearned Christians, in every land where the light and privileges of the gospel are most abundantly diffused and enjoyed? Whence is it that the mild, benevolent, peace-speaking religion of Jesus has been, and still is, disgraced by the wranglings and disputes of those who are solemnly commanded by their common Lord to dwell together in unity and love, as the brethren of one family, and the servants of one Master? Neither the nature of this religion, nor the volume which records it, furnishes any solution of the difficulty. No reason can there be discovered for such uncharitable dissensions.

The truth is, that all these differences, and all the controversies which have agitated the Christian church, are chargeable, in some sense, to prejudice—to the study and influence of theological systems, composed by schoolmen or philosophers, or spiritual dogmatists, or zealous enthusiasts, or aspiring ecclesiastical demagogues, and addressed to the credulity of their disciples, either as a substitute for the Bible or as a complete exposition of its doctrines. Thus we have embodied, in the elaborate tomes of divinity designed for the training of the youthful minister, and in the numberless religious books, tracts and catechisms prepared expressly for the laity, all sorts of crude speculation, of ingenious sophistry, of mystic reveries, of monstrous hallucinations, of logical subtleties and metaphysical refinements, which either human reason, or passion, or fancy, or ambition, or wisdom, or folly or cunning, or hypocrisy, may have been able to achieve or to inculcate.

This heterogeneous mixture of human absurdities with Divine revelation, has caused, and still nourishes, that captious persecuting spirit which has reigned for ages in the church. The gospel had scarcely appeared in the world, when it began to be adulterated by human contrivances. Among the Jews, it received much of its coloring from the Mosaic law and those traditionary institutions to which they were obstinately attached. Nor even among these did Christianity exhibit one uniform hue, but was diversely shaded according to the peculiarities of the several sects which embraced it:—as Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes and Herodians.

The Greeks and Romans, also, very soon endeavored to incorporate their favorite philosophy with the body of the gospel. The disciples of Pythagoras, of Zeno, of Epicurus, of Plato, of Aristotle, did not fail to discover some kind of resemblance between many of their maxims and those of the Messiah. And even where there evidently was none at all, pride and prejudice prompted them to fancy or create one. They had been long accustomed to yield implicit credence to the word of their masters; whose dogmas they frequently revered as eternal and immutable truths. They sought therefore to bend the gospel to suit their own preconceived opinions, instead of examining these before the light of revelation. The same observation may apply to the admirers of the Oriental philosophy, which gave rise to the

Gnostic and Manichean heresies. And in every country where the gospel was preached, there flourished a system of opinions deeply rooted in the minds of all classes of men. These, the gospel had to encounter: and it succeeded beyond all human probability—in a degree, indeed, which no human means could have effected. The banners of the cross were unfurled in every region perhaps of the habitable earth: and multitudes submitted unreservedly to its heavenly precepts. But many, however, and those generally of the most learned and ingenious, yielded only in part. They chose to form to themselves a mixed system—a compound of truth and error. So that, in a little space, the world presented as great a variety of Scripture glosses, or rather mongrel gospels, as there were schools of philosophy.

Some were led by comparisons instituted between Christ and the ancient sages, to treat them all with the same veneration and respect, Thus Alexander Severus paid divine honors indiscriminately to Christ and to Orpheus, to Apollonius, and the other philosophers and heroes whose names were famous in history or in fable.

Christianity therefore was constantly fluctuating and changing its aspect, according to the caprice, or genius, or learning of the great fathers and doctors who professed to teach it *ex cathedra* and agreeably to the most approved systems and authorities. They seem never to have thought of regulating their studies and researches by Scripture alone. To study theology, was to study a system constructed by some celebrated bishop or divine, who had devoted his days and nights to the dialectics of Aristotle or to the more captivating morality of Plato; and who, of course, had warped and perverted every gospel tenet to some kind of conformity to his own peculiar and more rational theory. Thus we may perceive that the gospel was not the cause of the early divisions in the church; but that these resulted solely from human devices and prejudices and anti-scriptural systems.

And when we contemplate the rapid progress of error in the world—the innumerable forms which the gospel was made to assume—the bitter animosities and furious contests which arose about the most insignificant quibbles and conceits—the colleges of divinity converted into nurseries of mere logomachy,—where, instead of the gospel, youth were carefully disciplined to manage with adroitness the noisy

artillery of the most contemptible logic and metaphysics that ever disgraced the seats of science and religion—we may then have some faint conception of the extravagant absurdities to which a blind devotion to human systems evidently conducted nearly the whole Christian world antecedently to the Reformation.

The seminaries of learning in the middle ages, were constantly thronged with champions who eagerly sought distinction by entering the lists of public disputation; who were fired with ambitious zeal to vanquish an opponent in some notable controversy, which was oftentimes unimportant in its very nature—ambiguous in its terms—a mere play upon words—or, at best, a matter of perfect indifference whether decided in one way or another, or in no way at all. It is almost incredible that these scholastic sophists could have excited so much interest as is everywhere assigned to them in history. That men of the first rate talents and acquirements should sacrifice their time, health and comfort for the despicable pleasure of clearing up difficulties which never existed but in their own brain—of reconciling contradictions by renouncing common sense—establishing axioms by rigorous demonstration, and thereby obscuring the simplest truths, and which every tyro comprehends and believes the moment he hears them announced—is, indeed, a severe and most humiliating satire upon poor arrogant human nature. Scripture, reason, conscience, were all rejected. And the venerable, sagacious, infallible successors of St. Peter wisely ventured to rear their proud temple of superstition, power and grandeur, upon a much more convenient and stable basis.

Whenever a sanctimonious aspiring dignitary wished to introduce any innovations in faith or ritual—to strengthen his authority or augment his revenue—nothing more was necessary than to summon to his aid the subtle schoolmen and dependent clergy, who were so thoroughly practised in the manœuvres and evolutions of monkish tactics and ghostly warfare, as easily to convince or silence all gainsayers, and to induce the besotted multitude to swallow the most palpable contradictions, and to sanction the most flagrant immoralities. The people were powerfully prepossessed in favor of the Pope and of the holy mother church. So that any lesson or mandate from such a source was generally received without the least question or scruple. Thus the gigantic great-

ness of this tremendous anti-christian hierarchy grew out of the early and gradual and steadily increasing admixture of human philosophy and inventions with Divine truth, and from the final triumph of the former over the latter. Such an example, and such a result, may well incline us to distrust all systems which would either supersede the diligent study of Scripture, or which would preclude or control the free exercise of our reason in its interpretation.

Have we then amongst us none of that crafty, arrogant, secular, arbitrary, inquisitorial, furious, vindictive, system-building, church-glorifying spirit which characterized the darker ages of Romish fanaticism and usurpation? That there are numerous sects—all recognizing the same gospel—each believing the others wrong—each pertinaciously adhering to its own peculiarities—each regarding the rest with a suspicious and evil eye—and all striving for the mastery in some fashion or other—will hardly be denied. Nay, we know that the most illiberal and exasperating contests frequently arise among members of the same Christian denomination. And to what cause shall we, at the present day, impute the existence of misunderstandings and dissensions, which, viewed through the glass of history, appear so strange, so puerile, so utterly inconsistent with every Christian grace, and with every principle of enlightened policy or of ordinary decorum; especially now, that the light of the Reformation, the invention of printing, the vast increase of knowledge, have dissipated so many errors, and paved the way for the detection of them all? We are constrained to attribute these, as similar effects, to the same cause. Instead of going directly to Scripture, which alone ought to be our guide, we (i. e. the simple, honest, credulous mass of both ministers and people,) imbibe our theological prejudices and tenets from human systems and expositions; or from the *dicta* of some living village or sectarian or metropolitan *de facto* pope. That is, we adopt our religion before we think of examining the only authentic record of its origin and character in existence.

There is something so preposterous in this mode of procedure that we cannot divine a semblance of excuse for pursuing it. Unless, indeed, we admit, what some assert, that there is danger of being led astray by too early an acquaintance with Scripture—that we ought previously to be

well grounded in the doctrines of our faith, in order that we may be less exposed to a misconception of the sacred writers, and have something settled and fixed in our minds to serve as a standard of truth. As if Divine revelation were less perfect and less intelligible than human speculation! As if Divine revelation needed the wisdom or the ingenuity of man to illustrate its simplest principles, and to bring them down to a level with common capacities: when we know that the gospel was originally preached by Christ and his Apostles to the humblest and most illiterate of mankind!

By the latter remarks, we would not intimate that every thing contained in the Bible can be understood by a mere perusal of the text,—far from it. There are mysteries—mysterious facts—which the most gifted and enlightened mind can never penetrate or unfold; and in examining which, the man of science has but little advantage over the unlettered peasant. There are many passages of a historic, prophetic, political and juridical nature—many poetic and allegorical representations—many singular allusions and graphic descriptions—many sententious proverbs and significant parables—many references to local customs, arts and ceremonies—together with many embarrassing difficulties of a mythological, geographical, physiological, idiomatic and critical character—which require a most extensive and thorough knowledge of almost every thing peculiar to the ancient world, including the languages also in which the whole was originally recorded. We would, by no means therefore, seem to depreciate the necessity or value of real science and profound scholarship. The more sound learning we can acquire, the better. But away with the trashy figments of the scholastic ages, in whatever novel forms they may be served up and garnished to suit the modern taste of knave or fool. Away with the polemic dogmatism and metaphysical cant of conceited, intolerant, bigoted, theological dictators of every church and party. Genuine divinity is contained in the Scriptures alone: and there only can it be learned in all its primeval purity and perfection. Were we therefore, with becoming diligence, humble docility, and prayerful sincerity, to study the Bible, unbiassed by prejudice or authority, we should seldom disagree in any matter of radical importance. The gracious Author of our religion

never designed to veil it in clouds and darkness in order to conceal it from vulgar eyes.

Considering then the manifest simplicity of the gospel, and the singularly benevolent spirit which it breathes, we might presume that the accredited ministers of Christ, who serve at his altar, who preach his cross and administer his ordinances, who devote their lives to the study and dispensation of his word, would be enabled to overcome all the difficulties which might occasion some slight discrepancies of opinion among men of ordinary opportunities and pursuits:—or, at least, that they would cordially harmonize in all essential points: while in regard to those of minor moment, the mere circumstantials of religion, they would charitably agree to differ. Why should not every honest Christian divine be disposed to address his brother in the language of Wesley? "Is thy heart right with God? If it be, give me thy hand. I do not mean, 'be of my opinion.' You need not. Neither do I mean, 'I will be of your opinion.' I cannot. Let all opinions alone; only give me thine hand." Why not be as teachable as Locke? "I read the word of God without prepossession or bias, and come to it with a resolution to take my sense from it, and not with a design to bring it to the sense of my system." Or as catholic as Robert Hall? "No man, or set of men, are entitled to prescribe as an indispensable condition of communion, what the New Testament has not enjoined as a condition of salvation."

But notwithstanding the reasonableness of this expectation, many of the clergy, even Protestant clergy, have betrayed more illiberality and bitterness in their conduct and publications than almost any other class of men in society. Their *odium theologicum* has become a proverbial and standing reproach. Their prejudices seem to be invincible, and their animosities inveterate.* And yet,

---

* Witness the melancholy and embittered contests between Luther and Calvin; which kept them as wide asunder, in heart or affection at least, as both were distant from their common adversary, the Pope. Witness the two hundred years' war between the Calvinists and Arminians about *five points*,—which some shrewd men have suspected, no doubt rashly or profanely, to be after all incomprehensible in their

1. In the first place: They have no solid reason for difering at all; as must appear from the whole tenor of our argument and illustrations.

2. In the second place: The greater part of them do not differ in matters of much importance: or the difference is rather verbal than real.

3. In the third place: Common sense ought to teach them the folly of contending for points that are scarcely perceptible; for quibbles in language which a grammarian would disdain to notice; for shades of distinction which no unjaundiced eye could ever trace; for punctilios of ceremony and discipline which are perfectly discretionary, which may be managed twenty ways equally well, or which may be omitted altogether; for modes of treating and expounding mysteries which are infinitely above our reach, and with which the Author of the gospel never intended that we should intermeddle further than he has revealed.

4. In the fourth place: Experience proves the impolicy and absurdity of conducting any controversies in that acrimonious abusive style which generally predominates in religious warfare. When deep-rooted prejudices encounter

---

very nature, and therefore inexplicable, and therefore undebatable. Witness the fierce gladiatorial combats of Episcopacy and Presbytery—of both with Independency or Congregationalism—of High Church and Low Church in all sects—of ultra orthodox and all sorts of self-styled moderate or liberal or peace men in every denomination. Witness the uncompromising and endless disputes about the mode and subjects of Baptism—about the particular day to be hallowed as the Christian Sabbath—about the nature and extent of the atonement—about original sin, free will, Divine agency, the proper office of the Holy Spirit in the work of conversion, etc., etc. Witness the deplorable divisions, the domestic feuds and family broils, which rend and distract the American churches of almost every name, at this day, under divers forms and pretexts. Indeed, the entire history of Protestant Christendom is replete with instances which corroborate all our positions, and amply demonstrate the folly and danger of confiding in human wisdom or authority to the neglect of the heavenly Teacher. Verily, "it is easier (as a profound thinker has declared,) to lead a hundred thousand men to battle than to vanquish a single prejudice."

each other, reason invariably retires from the field of battle. And the rival disputants frequently give full license to all their powers of satire, ridicule, invective and low scurrility; without once recollecting that their professed object was only to convince and reclaim a wandering brother. A discourteous, arrogant, overbearing mode of dealing with adversaries or errorists never did, and never will make a sincere convert. Its tendency is rather to confirm men in prejudice and error—to harden and exasperate and embitter the heart. More injury has probably been done to the cause of Christ by such narrow-minded impracticable bigots, than by the whole tribe of infidels and avowed opposers of the gospel since its first introduction into the world.

5. In the fifth place: The Scriptures of eternal truth condemn, in most decisive terms, this whole system or method of 'contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints,' by the dexterous employment of mere carnal weapons, furnished by an ambitious church or school or party champion. Charity is inscribed, as with a sunbeam, upon every page of this blessed volume. We are directed to bear with each other's infirmities; to "avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law, for they are unprofitable and vain." "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself." "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called; which some professing, have erred concerning the faith." "Flee also youthful lusts: but follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart. But foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes. And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient; in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." "It is (remarks Dr. Campbell,) the

liberal advice of an apostle: 'Prove all things, hold fast that which is good;'—an advice which breathes nothing of that narrow, sectarian spirit, which has so long and so generally prevailed among Christians of all denominations, and hath proved the greatest pest of the cause." "It is indeed shocking (says Toplady, whose own practice, by the way, did not always accord with his precept,) that those who profess to experience and to preach the love of Christ, can so far prostitute the dignity and design of their sacred calling, as to seek to exasperate differing parties against each other, instead of laboring to preserve unity of spirit, to strengthen the bond of peace, and to promote righteousness of life."

Many persons, no doubt, reject and denounce the gospel without examination, because its rash, obstinate, official advocates betray the cause by their mutual persecutions and recriminations. They will judge of its excellence by [what they mistake for] its effects upon the lives of its teachers. They despise, and with reason, the contentious, intolerant, uncompromising spirit which reigns among them. They perceive also the utter want of worldly prudence and judicious tact in all such conduct. "The true secret (says Hume) for the discreet management of sectarists, is to tolerate them." When unopposed, their strength is spent in the air, and they die of themselves. In this sentiment, the shrewd philosophical skeptic is supported by the learned commentator on the Laws of England. "Undoubtedly (observes Judge Blackstone) all persecution and oppression of weak consciences, on the score of religious persuasion are highly unjustifiable upon every principle of natural reason, civil liberty, or sound religion." Man is *naturally* accountable to no tribunal for the soundness of his faith and the purity of his worship, but to that only which can search the heart. "To banish, imprison, plunder, starve, hang and burn men for religion, (says Jortin,) is not the gospel of Christ; it is the gospel of the devil. Where persecution begins, Christianity ends. Christ never used any thing that looked like force or violence except once: and that was to drive bad men out of the temple, and not to drive them in."

Now we fain would know in what persecution essentially consists. In this enlightened age, it is generally conceded that men ought to be allowed to worship God according to the

dictates of their own consciences; that no laws ought to be enacted, tending in the least to endanger liberty, life or property, on the ground of religious belief or profession. But can men be injured, persecuted and oppressed only in personal liberty, life or property? Is it no persecution to sport with the feelings of men?—to cavil against, condemn and ridicule principles and ceremonies which they regard most sacred? Is it no persecution to denounce the members of a dissenting sect or individuals of our own sect whose *shibboleth* we cannot or will not enunciate, as deluded fanatics or obdurate heretics—as crafty designing hypocrites—as wilful and impudent perverters of gospel language and doctrines—as ambitious conformists to the corrupt maxims of the world—as morose churlish devotees, who would deprive us of every rational enjoyment—or as ravenous wolves in sheep's clothing? Is it no persecution to hold men up before the public as objects of scorn and derision—as insidious corrupters of the popular morals, whose society ought, above all things, to be avoided?—to set a mark of disgrace upon them, which must render their name odious to all but their own particular communion or party? In a word, to wound their character in the tenderest points; to destroy their comfort, as far as possible, in this world, and to consign them to perdition in the next? If this be not persecution, and of no very gentle character too, then the term to us has no meaning and no application. 'The apostle indeed forewarned the early converts that there must be heresies in the church, that they who are approved may be made manifest: but it does not occur to these fiery zealots, that a system of persecution for opinion is the worst of all heresies, as it violates at once truth and charity.'

But while we thus appear the advocate of charity in opposition to sectarian bigotry, which always results from prejudice of some kind, we would not forget that even bigots and persecutors have a claim upon our charity. They, too, are not unfrequently, rather to be commiserated than harshly condemned. St. Paul, when hurried onward by his prejudices—by zeal without knowledge—to the most revolting acts of cruelty and violence upon the harmless unresisting followers of Christ, was an object of pity rather than of hatred. He was honest, though misguided. His ignorance however could not excuse him, because it was voluntary.

He had the means of being better informed. But his bigoted attachment to the system in which he had been educated, shut the door to inquiry and to light. And, without a miracle, he probably would never have seen his errors.

Many examples might be cited to illustrate the difficulty with which men are emancipated from the trammels of prejudice; and our obligations to exercise much tenderness and forbearance towards them. "My own case (says Luther, in a description of his feelings respecting the matters in dispute between Eckius and himself,) is a notable example of the difficulty with which a man emerges from erroneous notions of long standing. How true is the proverb: 'custom is a second nature.' How true is that saying of Augustin: 'habit, if not resisted, becomes necessity.' I who, both publicly and privately, had taught divinity with the greatest diligence for seven years, insomuch that I retained in my memory almost every word of my lectures, was, in fact, at that time only just initiated into the knowledge and faith of Christ: I had only just learned that a man must be justified and saved, not by works, but by the faith of Christ: and lastly, in regard to pontifical authority, though I publicly maintained that the Pope was not the head of the church by a *Divine right*, yet I stumbled at the very next step, namely, that the whole Papal system was a satanic invention. This I did not see, but contended obstinately for the Pope's *right*, founded on *human reasons*: so thoroughly deluded was I, by the example of others, by the title of *Holy Church*, and by my own habits. Hence I have learned to have more candor for bigoted Papists, especially if they are not much acquainted with sacred, or perhaps even with profane history." "In the schools (he observes again,) I lost Jesus Christ: I have now found him in St. Paul."

But even this enlightened reformer and indefatigable inquirer after truth, fell at last far short of a complete victory over the prejudices of the age in which he lived, and in which he had been nurtured. His doctrine of consubstantiation, for instance, is regarded by a large majority of Protestant Christians as not a whit less unscriptural and contradictory than that of transubstantiation which he reprobated. "Truth is seldom seen at once in its full order and proportion of parts." And "strong conviction is much more apt to breed strife in matters of little moment than in subjects of high importance."

Scott, in his Force of Truth, has exhibited his own experience on this subject. His case was somewhat peculiar, and certainly very unpromising. He seemed "lost in error's endless maze." His slow progress, step by step, with much study and research; reluctantly yielding up, inch after inch, the ground which he had already assumed, and which he seemed resolved, at all hazards, to maintain; and his final surrender of the whole before the broad day-light and omnipotence of truth; may serve to expose the despotic power of prejudice, and to point out the proper way to overcome and subdue it.*

---

* Widely different was the procedure of Dr. Priestley, and widely different also was the result: as the following paragraph from a Quarterly Reviewer of 1812, may show. The *rationale* here given is characteristic and illustrative of the course pursued by many a superior mind in similar circumstances. It is not uncommon for a man to be great and liberal and just in one department of scientific investigation, while he is quite the reverse in another. There have been but few Ciceros and Bacons and Lockes and Newtons even among the *nomina clara* of philosophy.

"In his theological and philosophical pursuits, he [Priestley] seemed to be compounded of two different men. It was not to his penetrating genius only that mankind are indebted for his vast discoveries in chemistry, but to a spirit of investigation exact and persevering in this department—proceeding by cautious induction which allowed much slower understandings to keep pace with his own, and guarding against error in his conclusions by frequent repetition of his experiments. It is not a little remarkable, however, that in his theological pursuits, and more especially in those of ecclesiastical history, in which he most disgracefully failed, the conduct of his understanding was precisely reversed. He began with conclusions, and then sought for premises to justify them. Having previously made up his mind that certain doctrines could not have come from God, he proceeded by a species of analysis peculiar to himself, to demonstrate that they were not contained in Scripture. To this end the analogies of language were set aside, grammar tortured, and rules of lax interpretation applied to the most decisive and convincing texts, by which any thing might be deduced from any thing. Above all, mystery was to be discarded, and the philosopher, who knew and acknowledged that the most common operations of

"The authors of all systems (says a judicious divine) are more or less prejudiced in behalf of some particular and artificial mode of faith. He, therefore, who begins with the study of them, and afterwards proceeds to the sacred volume, sees with a jaundiced eye every text supporting the peculiar tenets of his first master, and acts as absurd a part as he who tries not the gold by the copal, but the copal by the gold. The principles of real theology are to be found only in the word and works of God: and he who would extract them pure and unsophisticated, must dig for them himself in that exhaustless mine."

But should it be objected, that if we were to discard all human auxiliaries and authorities, and to search the Scriptures alone with attention and candor, still there would be no unity in doctrine; we answer in the words of Chillingworth: "1. It is impossible you should know this, considering that there are many places in Scripture which do more than probably import, that the want of piety in living, is the cause of want of unity in believing. 2. That there would be unity of opinion in all things necessary, and that in things not necessary, unity of opinion is not necessary. 3. But lastly, that notwithstanding differences in these things of lesser importance, there might and would be unity of communion, unity of charity and affection, which is one of the greatest blessings which the world is capable of; absolute unity of opinion being a matter rather to be desired than hoped for." Such catholic sentiments in the reign of the first Charles are worthy of all praise.*

---

nature quickly ran up into causes and principles, which eluded even his own penetrating research; when he assumed the character of the theologian, and undertook to investigate subjects which are in no degree the objects of sense, would not endure that the Almighty should 'veil himself in clouds,' and that 'darkness should be the habitation of his seat.'"

* We do not recollect ever to have conversed with an individual, whether of the clergy or laity, who did not claim to be exempt from all prejudice and uncharitableness. The truth is, most men deceive themselves in this matter. They are charitable on a grand scale—towards the heathen, it may be—and all the world, afar off. But at home—towards their nearest brethren of another party name—they indulge the temper

We are aware that the tenor of this whole discussion is directly opposed to the popular voice on the subject. It is generally esteemed an evidence of a strong, original, independent mind to have settled or firmly established opinions at an early period;—a mark of intellectual superiority and moral courage never to doubt, or waver, or change, when once we have adopted our opinions;—a point of honor to sustain and defend them on all occasions and at all hazards. And this too, nothwithstanding they may oftentimes have been embraced upon the most flimsy grounds, or without any reason whatever. Such a person has effectually closed every door and avenue to the acquisition of knowledge. He has eyes, but he sees not; ears, but he hears not; understanding, but he perceives not. He moves in a charmed circle. He cannot get out of it, or look beyond it. He is a one-sided, wrong-headed, self-sufficient politician or religionist as long as he lives. Now, an opinionated man—especially a young man who is just entering upon the threshold of liberal inquiry—and, above all, one who is commencing a course of theological study with a view to the sacred ministry—is, at best, but a sorry specimen of adventurous blindfold humanity. We cannot but regard him as a vain deluded creature, who is about to impose on himself a tedious painful drudgery, through which we foresee he will doggedly worry, without the slightest prospect of ever becoming one jot the wiser. He has prejudged the cause, and is fully resolved never to alter one article or clause of his creed. Nay, this creed may have been prescribed to him by authority at the outset: and he may have been required to bind himself

---

and feelings of a *Dominic* or a *Bonner*. Thus, a loyal churchman, contemporary with Chillingworth, in a letter to a friend, the chief scope of which would seem to be the exhibition of himself as a paragon of Christian charity, after sundry honeyed phrases, adds, with infinite *naivté*, the following precious proof: "Difference in opinion may work a disaffection in me, but not a detestation; I rather pity than hate Turk or Infidel, for they are of the same metal, and bear the same stamp as I do, though the inscriptions differ. If I hate any, it is those schismatics that puzzle the sweet peace of our church; so that I could be content to see an Anabaptist go to hell on a Brownist's back." *Letter of James Howell, Esq., to Sir Ed. B. Knight.*

by promise or oath never to believe, think, act or teach, except in conformity with its arbitrary instructions. Yet, however much we may commiserate the weakness or folly or rashness or hardihood of such an individual, or however much we may dread and deplore the consequences likely to result from his future influence as a spiritual guide or ecclesiastical dignitary, he will be lauded and honored by his party as a bold, consistent, high-minded, unflinching advocate of orthodoxy. But is there honesty—is there independence—is there magnanimity in such a course, or in the mind that can be constrained to pursue it? "The dogmatist (says Campbell) knows nothing of degrees, either in evidence or in faith. He has properly no opinions or doubts. Every thing with him is either certainly true or certainly false. Of this turn of mind I shall only say, that far from being an indication of vigor, it is a sure indication of debility in the intellectual powers." "In all cases (remarks Beattie) where dogmatical belief tends to harden the heart, or to breed prejudices incompatible with candor, humanity, and the love of truth, all good men will be careful to cultivate moderation and diffidence."*

---

* We have not designed, in this rambling essay, to approach the question about the necessity or the expediency of creeds, confessions, and articles of religion. It will be time enough to reject them, when experience shall have proved it practicable for any church to exist without them. We merely hold, that the public teacher of Christianity ought to be thoroughly conversant with Scripture in order to be qualified to subscribe honestly to any creed or formulary. When he has thus voluntarily and conscientiously subscribed, he is of course bound to preach accordingly. He cannot, in good faith, adhere ostensibly to any church or ecclesiastical connexion, while opposed to its doctrines or government. It is his duty to leave such connexion whenever he finds it irksome, oppressive or criminal to comply with its known and acknowledged requisitions, or to fulfil his own promises and engagements.

As to children, and the mass of the people, they must ever be, in a large measure, dependent on parental and ministerial instructions. So much the greater is the urgency for a well educated, faithful, devoted ministry, to give the proper tone and character to every gradation of inferior and subordinate teachers. Nor do we object to the use of theological systems,

How often do we see men who have heard or perused only one side of a furious controversy, declare themselves perfectly convinced, and unalterably fixed in their opinions? They act like an ignorant jury, whose passions are excited and whose judgments are thereby swayed or bribed to assent to any measure or award which a skilful advocate may urge in behalf of his client: and who would, if then called upon for a decision, undoubtedly find an unrighteous verdict. They would decide under the influence of passion, prejudice and partial information. Such injustice or iniquity, however, is generally prevented by their being compelled to hear counsel for the defendant also. They therefore gradually become cool and self-possessed while listening, it may be, to a clear, simple, judicious, matter-of-fact argument or statement from the opposite party: or, if their passions shall be again appealed to, the two directly contrary fires will destroy or neutralize each other's effects, and leave them once more in the exercise of reason and common sense. We ought, then, in all our pursuits after truth, particularly when sought amidst the flames of controversy, to be "persuaded that moments of passion are always moments of delusion; that nothing truly is what it then seems to be; that all the opinions which we then form, are erroneous; and all the judgments which we pass, are extravagant." *Blair.*

---

commentaries, etc., provided they be rigidly tried and judged by the 'law and the testimony,' and not implicitly followed as paramount and infallible guides. But, the Bible first, above all, without rival or peer, always open and in hand, constantly studied 'without note or comment,' and with the single purpose of arriving at the 'mind of the Spirit' in the language of the Spirit.

The answer of Luther to his friend George Spalatinus, on being requested to give him his advice concerning the best method of acquiring sacred knowledge, deserves to be remembered and practised by every student in divinity. After recommending to his notice certain parts of the writings of Jerome, Ambrose and Augustin, he exhorts him always to begin his studies with *serious prayer:* for, says he, "there is really no interpreter of the Divine word, but its own Author." He adds: "Read the Bible in order from the beginning to the end."

A single notorious fact might lead us, without further inquiry, to suspect the dangerous tendency of theological systems, devised to regulate and control human reason. It is this: We universally find that, at least, ninety-nine hundredths of mankind, learned and unlearned, live and die fully persuaded of the truth and excellence of the doctrines and ceremonies of that particular sect to which they happen to belong by birth. The evil of instilling party prejudices and opinions into the youthful mind must therefore be conceded: or we must allow that the creeds of Papist and Protestant, of Socinian and Athanasian, are equally good and true. Nay, by the same rule, we ought to apologize for the Jew, the Mohammedan, and the Pagan. For these, too, believe as they have been taught. Such is human nature: whatever men may have imbibed from early childhood with implicit confidence, they inflexibly retain and cherish—especially every thing of a sacred nature. A kind of superstitious veneration, a solemn dread of indulging what might be accounted an impious curiosity, ordinarily prevents all future investigation, and confirms them in the faith of their fathers. Now, what argument can be plausibly advanced *a priori* for preferring the system of one sect to that of another? How ought an unbiassed individual (if one there be,) still ignorant of Christianity but desirous to become acquainted with its principles, to choose among them? How would you advise him to proceed? Would you direct him to this or that sectarian system or confession, and assure him of its entire agreement with the Scriptures? But, suppose he should ask, Does not every sect possess a system or profess a creed founded, in like manner, exclusively upon the same Scriptures? Do they not all affirm that the word of God—the Bible—is the only authentic and unerring criterion by which to distinguish truth from falsehood? And do they not all loudly proclaim their ability to establish by it every tittle of their doctrine and church polity? He would be exceedingly perplexed, and utterly at a loss to know where to begin or what course to pursue, unless his own good sense should suggest to him the obvious propriety of neglecting them all for the present, and of recurring at once to the sacred paramount standard which all receive as infallible and reverence as divine.

Finally: What is there so captivating or magical or potent

in a mere name, that we should suffer ourselves to be duped or dazzled by it or subjected to its dominion? It can neither protect us from error and mischief, nor guide us in the sure road to heavenly peace and happiness. Why do we not then study the gospel of Jesus Christ, rather than the gospel of Luther, or Calvin, or Hopkins, or Wesley? Why do we not, in this respect, heed the injunction of the Apostle to the primitive converts, not to account themselves the disciples of Paul or Apollos or Cephas or of any other human teacher or master, however eminent or gifted? And why, when we pretend to take the Scriptures as our only authority, do we dread a sentiment or doctrine or truth evidently set forth therein merely because it may be in favor with an unpopular or dissenting party? Why do we hesitate to welcome truth, even though a heretic or infidel may have stumbled upon it? If, indeed, we ever become earnest, dispassionate, persevering seekers after truth, we shall inevitably subscribe to many things which have been admitted by all the belligerant Christian sects—not because they admit them, but because the Bible clearly reveals them. We shall retain much that is common to all. We shall not be Calvinists perhaps, nor Arminians. We shall have become the honest followers of Jesus Christ and of him only. If so, we shall be ready to extend our charity to all his sincere disciples, by whatever appellation they may be known among men. We shall estimate Christian sincerity by the life and practice, rather than by the profession. We shall learn to judge by the fruits, and not by the peculiarities of a creed. Let us then dare to make the gospel the only basis of our faith, and the only rule of our conduct. And we may calmly bid defiance to the slanders and reproaches of an illiberal, bigoted, misjudging, captious world.

If we know our own hearts (the faithful pastors should be able to say,) we fain would be divested of all sectarian and of all secular pride and prejudice. We would preach to guilty perishing sinners neither this nor that distinguished divine or reformer. We would preach Jesus Christ and him crucified. We would acknowledge ourselves his servants and his only. We would glory in his cross, and in being esteemed his ambassadors and ministers: and as such, we should feel ourselves invested with an official character and authority infinitely above what any man or ecclesiastical body can impart.

Should we then ascend to the fountain head, and no longer be contented with the shallow and turbid streams, which are flowing in every direction from spurious or poisoned sources, wonderful and glorious would be the effects. How soon would petty distinctions vanish away—party animosities cease—and Christians every where be disposed to banish envy, malice, pride and bigotry! "Universal charity would throw wide her arms, and humility stoop to the tenderest offices of beneficence. Dove-like meekness would smile with benignity in her heart and candor upon her lips." "Blessed are the peace-makers: for they shall be called the children of God."

ARTICLE II.

The Comparative Moral Purity of Ancient and Modern Literature.

By Edwin D. Sanborn, Prof. Lat. and Gr. Languages and Literature, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

Literature is the mirror of national character. It reflects both the beauties and deformities of the age, in which it originates. The learned and the common mind acting reciprocally upon each other, the characteristics of both are transmitted to posterity in the productions of genius and art. Superior mental endowments are, undoubtedly, the gift of God, yet these find their appropriate stimulus in the excitements of the popular mind, and are fostered by popular praise. In the world's literary history, we occasionally meet with an author who lives in advance of his age and writes for a more enlightened posterity. Such were Homer, Dante, Milton and Bacon. Others act as the teachers and guides of their contemporaries. They discuss those subjects which are of deepest interest to the common mind. Seeing the multitude eagerly contending for principles but imperfectly conceived and partially understood, bringing to the task a nicer discrimination and a more comprehensive intellect, they collect the scattered elements of truth, as they

exist amid conflicting opinions, and present them, united in one beautiful whole, to the contemplation of an admiring multitude. These are the men who leave the impress of their own minds upon the rising generation, challenge the gratitude of posterity and are justly styled the benefactors of their race. But a large majority of authors prepare their works expressly for the *market*. They write to please the multitude. They seek popular applause, and they have their reward. Such writers, incorporating, in their works, the prevailing tastes, prejudices and principles of their times, become the representatives of their age, the true indices of national character. No opinion is too absurd, no superstition too degrading, no vice too loathsome, no crime too revolting to find even a *talented* advocate, if the multitude approve.

It will be readily granted that splendid talents often attract the attention of the vulgar and raise them from their low desires and grovelling pursuits to the contemplation of nobler themes; yet, it oftener happens that the multitude drag down the gifted mind to their own level, and make it the pander of their degraded appetites. Hence the popular literature of every age is tainted by popular vices. This literature, moulded by the habits, feelings, sympathies, prejudices, vices and follies of the age becomes, in turn, an active agent in forming the morals and minds of those who read. Viewed in this light, the influence of those great vices, against which the spirit of our times is arrayed, upon the literature of different ages, cannot be deemed a trifling subject by any well-wisher of his race. The devotee of intemperance and sensuality cannot give utterance to his thoughts without betraying his inherent corruption. The influence of these vices pervades the whole man. Both the moral and physical constitution is corrupt. Not a single filament of nerve or capillary tube remains unscathed, no chamber of the soul unpolluted. The intellectual offspring of such an author must betray its infamous parentage. National vices are thus transmitted to succeeding generations, and time, which destroys every thing else, that is human, only strengthens the influence of splendid crimes. The licentious goddess of Grecian lyrics still breathes her poisonous influence into the soul of the modern student, and the amorous ditties and bacchanalian songs of Roman bards are still

conned with pleasure by the modern sensualist. The influence of ancient literature, however, is comparatively feeble, owing to the limited number of those who study it, and to our want of sympathy with the manners and usages of ancient times. Much of ancient literature, we acknowledge, is corrupt; but we do not hesitate to assert, that a larger proportion of modern literature is still *more corrupt.* Modern literature is the strong-hold of national sympathies. Written in our own language, portraying scenes like those we have witnessed, describing emotions like those we have felt and presenting countless associations kindred to our own, it comes home to the heart of the reader, touches all the springs of human sympathy and moulds the character of the man.

It has recently become quite popular in order to disparage the study of the classics, to denounce them, en masse, as the puerile and worthless productions of a barbarous age, and to extol the moderns as the only efficient helps to a liberal education and the only safe models of imitation. Some writers, in their zeal for reform, would charge upon the authors of antiquity all the crimes of later times, would bring upon them all the blood that has been shed since the fall of Imperial Rome, and fasten upon them all the intemperance and sensuality which are the offspring of modern luxury. The gentle advocate of peace is shocked with those tales of war and bloodshed which blacken the page of ancient history. "The natural selfishness and injustice of the ancients," says Mr. Simpson, "are *positively recommended* as the noblest objects of imitation; the history of their murderous and aggressive wars, rapine and martial glory is listened to *with delight* and made in mimic essay the pastime of the playground of every grammar school." Are these historians then to be charged with the guilt and folly of those teachers who *positively recommend* injustice and selfishness to the imitation of their pupils, and with the perversity and wickedness of those students who delight in tales of bloodshed? Were we to destroy all books that treat of human selfishness and injustice, literature would be annihilated. If we were to banish from our libraries all books that treat of murderous and aggressive wars, national history would be a blank, and the Bible itself must be mutilated.

In treating of the virtues or vices of the ancients, partisan writers generally run into the extremes of commendation or

censure. But in discoursing of this subject as well as others, the direction of the poet is a safe one: "In medio tutissimus ibis." The ancients, it is frequently said, were universally intemperate. In a certain sense this is true. They were *systematically* intemperate, but their revels were only *periodical.* In many of their religious festivals excessive drinking was practised, in some it was *enjoined* as an acceptable service to the god they honored.

Their religion was a religion of the senses. The prevailing element of their worship was excitement. They gave full indulgence to their animal appetites and "allowed the passions of earth to keep holiday in honor of Heaven." Sacrifices and pæans, music and dancing, revelry and feasting were the most convincing proofs of their devotion. But these carousals were only *occasional.* The common people were not habitual topers. Only the more wealthy class could enjoy the luxuries of life and furnish their tables with the choicest viands and wines. During the public festivals every citizen made merry and sometimes a whole city was sunk in intoxication. But it is well known that an occasional debauch is not so injurious either to the soul or body as the habitual though *moderate* use of unnatural stimulants. The injury inflicted upon public morals and health by an occasional revel in the city of Athens cannot be compared with the results of the habitual drinking of modern European nations.

The religion of the ancients being thus sensual, their literature, which, in its infancy, was the offspring of religion, must exhibit similar characteristics. Poetry was ever employed in the worship of the gods. If the deities they worshipped were licentious and intemperate, the hymns composed in their praise must necessarily reflect their vices. The drama originated in the worship of the god of wine, and while under the form of comedy it pandered for the corrupted taste of the rabble, it was deeply stained with immorality and indecency. Tragedy, however, adopted a higher standard of morality, rose above the desires of the unthinking multitude and furnished, for the intelligent hearer, an intellectual treat which could not offend the ear of purity itself. But more of this hereafter. Poetry, in its infancy, was wedded to religion, and of course, exhibited all the imperfections of that religion. Soon, however, it left the airy regions of

mythology and walked with men on earth. It then became the handmaid of history and science, the mirror of human thoughts, sympathies, habits and laws. The Epic of Homer gives us a full length picture of the Grecian hero, with all the strong points of his character illuminated as by a sunbeam. And was this hero a drunkard? To be sure, says one; "for after every battle, sacrifice or council of war, they had a drunken revel and not unfrequently a drunken brawl." But let us examine this point more minutely. It must be remembered that the heroes of Homer were, by no means acquainted with the refinements of a subsequent Grecian age or the luxuries of Roman Epicureanism; much less with the delicacies of a modern Parisian table. They were sturdy warriors. They did nothing by halves. They fought like amateurs; they ate like gourmands; they drank like topers, still they were neither fiends, gluttons, nor drunkards. Every part of their character was in perfect keeping with the whole. Their virtues and vices were in excess. Their love of country was unquenchable; their hospitality proverbial; their honor unsullied; their eloquence unrivalled; their wrath unappeasable; their might irresistible. Such was the Grecian hero. What wonder then, if, after the fatigues of war, men of such strong passions should *revel?* Homer paints them as they were. Their characters are drawn with artless simplicity, and making suitable allowances for poetic embellishment, with perfect accuracy—There is nothing in the description of their banquets to fire the most ardent imagination, nothing to tempt the most excitable spirit or seduce the weakest virtue. The time, place and manner of their feasting are described in the most unvarnished style. Scarcely any part of the poems of Homer is less labored or more *uninteresting* to the general reader than his descriptions of the heroic festivals and sacrifices—Nothing is added to render the scene captivating or to recommend intemperance to the dainty reader. He says they feasted largely and drank copiously, but he does not say that they were disguised or besotted. He uses little variety in describing the different festivals that occur in his works. The same words are frequently repeated. After describing minutely the preparations for the feast and the manner of partaking of it, he usually adds something like the following, which occurs in the first book of the Iliad;

> "When now the rage of hunger was repressed,
> With pure libations they conclude the feast;
> The youths with wine the copious goblets crown'd,
> And pleas'd, dispense the flowing bowls around."

They usually drank after the fatigues of a battle and frequently before fighting to nerve them to greater effort. Ulysses, before battle counsels Achilles to give his soldiers wine and food, for, says he:

> "Strength is derived from spirits and from blood
> And these augment by generous wine and food."

Such advice would have been regarded as quite prudent even with us, a few years since. Sometimes the warriors are represented as simply satisfying the demands of appetite. When the princes feasted in the tent of Agamemnon, the poet says:

> "Each seiz'd a portion of the kingly feast,
> But stay'd his hand when thirst and hunger ceased."

The expression most frequently used, by the poet, on such occasions implies that they simply satisfied the calls of nature. But allowing that his heroes were intemperate and licentious, he does not commend those traits to the imitation of the reader; nor does he, by the power of his genius, throw such a charm around these vices as to tempt others to adopt them.—"It is not in him," says Mr. Pope, "as in our modern romances where men are drawn in perfection, and we but read with a *tender weakness* what we can neither apply nor emulate." Homer wrote for men, and therefore he wrote of men; if the world had been better, he would have shown it so. As a faithful painter of human actions he describes the *vices* as well as the virtues of his heroes. The existence of these vices is the fault of the times not of the poet. He has not failed to leave his own testimony in favor of temperance and chastity in numerous instances.

Some of his characters are perfect patterns in these virtues. Hector and Penelope may be cited as instances, the one of temperance, the other of unsullied chastity.—When the mother of Hector thus advises him to drink freely:

> "Then with a plenteous draught refresh thy soul
> And draw new spirits from the gen'rous bowl;"

the hero replies in language that would not disgrace a moral philosopher;

> "Far hence be Bacchus' gifts,—
> Inflaming wine, pernicious to mankind,
> Unnerves the limbs and dulls the noble mind.
> Let chiefs *abstain*, and spare the sacred juice
> To sprinkle to the gods, its better use."

It will be recollected that the strong man of old was a water drinker; and Milton in his Samson Agonistes discovers his own regard for strict temperance, by frequently enlarging upon this virtue. In one instance we find sentiments similar to those contained in the last quotation from Homer put into the mouths of the interlocutors.

Chorus. "Desire of wine and all delicious drinks,
Which many a famous warrior overturns,
Thou could'st repress; nor did the dancing ruby
Sparkling, outpour'd, the flavor or the smell,
Allure thee from the cool crystalline stream."

Samson. "Whenever fountain or fresh current flow'd
Against the eastern ray, translucent, pure
With touch ethereal of Heaven's fiery rod,
I drank, from the clear milky juice allaying
Thirst, and refresh'd: nor envied them the grape
Whose heads that turbulent liquor fills with fumes."

There are but few objectionable passages in Homer in respect to intemperance and licentiousness; and, there are still fewer in Virgil. His scenes of festivity and love are described with greater delicacy of language and purity of thought than those of Homer. In the Æneid there is nothing to tempt the weakest virtue on the score of intemperance, unless the rage of thirst may be enkindled by such simple phrases as the following: "Vina coronant;" "Indulgent vino;" "Somno vinoque soluti." In one passage in the Georgics, where he recommends the cultivation of useful trees instead of the vine, he strongly expresses his conviction of the injurious tendency of wine-bibbing. After mentioning the uses to which the various forest trees may be appropriated, he adds,

> "Quid memorandum æque Baccheia dona tulerunt?
> Bacchus et ad culpam causas dedit," etc.——

which Dryden thus translates:

> "Now balance with these gifts, the fumy joys
> Of wine, attended with eternal noise.
> Wine urg'd to lawless lust the Centaur's train:
> Thro' wine they quarrel'd and thro' wine were slain."

The Roman poet Lucretius wrote upon scientific subjects and had but little occasion to allude to the habits or morals of social life. In one instance attempting to prove the materiality and mortality of the human soul, from the effects of inebriation upon it, he uses the following language;

> "When wine's quick force has pierced the brain,
> And the brisk heat's diffused thro' every vein,
> Why do the members all grow dull and weak,
> The tongue not with its usual swiftness speak?
> The eye balls swim? the legs not firm and straight
> But bend beneath the body's natural weight?
> Unmanly quarrels, noise and sobs deface
> The pow'rs of reason and usurp its place.
> How could this be, did not the precious juice,
> *Affect the mind itself and spoil its use?*"

From the brutalizing effect of wine, this Epicurean poet attempts to prove that man is kindred to the brute and that the soul which can thus be degraded and besotted with wine is material and mortal. Compare the thoughts above quoted of this heathen atheistical poet with a passage from the "Divine Spencer," "the purity, devotion and exalted morality" of whose writings have been often commended.

The following "*noble lines*" as they are called by Mr. Gifford are supposed to be an imitation of a paragraph in the 7th satire of Juvenal:

> "Whoever casts to compass weighty prize,
> Let pour in *lavish cups* and generous meat,
> For Bacchus' fruit is friend to Phœbus wise;
> And when with wine the brain begins to sweat,
> The numbers flow as fast as spring doth rise."
>
> "Thou ken'st not, Percie, how the rime would rage,
> O if my temples were distained with wine:—
> How I would rear the Muse on stately stage,
> And teach her tread aloft in buskins fine,
> With quaint Bellona in her equipage!"

It is true of ancient epic poetry, generally, that it has little to inflame the passions of the modern sensualist. If the revels of bacchanalians are described, the picture is too gross to be alluring. They make no effort to throw a charm among the festive scene. They say little of the sweet de-

lights the delicious reveries and extatic joys of inebriation. If there be vicious thoughts in their productions, they are not *covertly* expressed. The poison of vice is not wrapped in the garb of *imaginary* pleasure to render it agreeable. Vice, generally, owes its attractiveness to the artificial decorations that are thrown around it; when divested of these, it becomes disgusting. "Among the ancients," says Porson, "plain speaking was the fashion; nor was that ceremonious delicacy introduced, which has taught men to abuse each other with the utmost politeness and express the *most indecent* ideas in the *most modest* language. The ancients had little of this. They were accustomed to give to every thing its proper name." But it is not so with modern writers. Those who *now* write for the popular eye are *less gross* but not *less corrupt:* more *refined,* and on that account, *more* dangerous. They teach libertinism by circumlocutions, and suggestions, and propagate their corrupt sentiments by hints and innuendos. Public opinion has been so far reformed, by Christianity, as to render it necessary for unprincipled men to assume the garb and language of virtue. Modern Anacreons, therefore, appear more like temperate men, and literature becomes more plausibly vicious. Its appeals are made to our most tender sensibilities, to those "amiable weaknesses" of our nature, (as they have been preposterously named by some of our "*sentimental*" writers,) which so readily yield to the seductions of sense. These remarks apply, more particularly, to dramatic and lyric poetry. The drama has been called the school of morals, and yet, in a majority of instances, its influence has been decidedly prejudicial to morals.

The character of ancient comedy cannot be defended. It deserves no apology. It originated in the buffoonery and low jesting that accompanied the worship and festivals of Bacchus. In its infancy, it was the amusement of the lowest rabble; in its maturity, it catered for the tastes of the multitude. Though it contains many noble sentiments happily expressed and much unrivalled wit and eloquence, yet as a whole it is deeply contaminated with licentiousness, intemperance and obscenity. Many of these indecencies, however, are rather offences against *taste* than morality, more gross than corrupt. Yet vulgar as it is, its very obscenity is surpassed not only by modern dramatists but by

modern divines. The writings of Swift and Sterne are equally offensive and far more pernicious in their tendency. It is to the disgrace of civilization and the deep dishonor of Christianity, that the very hierophants of heathen orgies should in obscenity and vulgarity be outheathened by a Doctor of Divinity. Dr. Johnson in his life of Swift says, "The greatest difficulty that occurs in analyzing his character is to discover by what depravity of intellect he took delight in revolving ideas from which almost every other mind shrinks with disgust. The ideas of pleasure, even when criminal may solicit the imagination, but what has disease, deformity and filth, upon which the thoughts can be allured to dwell?"

If ancient comedy *deserves* no apology, on the score of decency and purity, *ancient tragedy needs none.* "In lamenting the corruptions of the theatre, in Athens," says Mrs. Hannah More, "justice compels us to acknowledge, that her immortal tragic poets, by their chaste and manly composition, furnish a noble exception. In no country has decency and purity, and to the disgrace of Christian countries, let it be added, have *morality* and even *piety* been so generally prevalent in any theatrical compositions as in what

> ——'her lofty grave tragedians taught
> In chorus of Iambic, teachers best
> Of moral prudence.'"

Having the decision of *such a judge*, of one whose good sense and piety cannot be questioned, we need not quote passages to prove our assertion. The same author in remarking of the English drama, says, "our tragic poets have afforded scarce any instances, except Milton in his exquisite Comus and Samson Agonistes, and Mason in his chaste and classic dramas in which we can conscientiously recommend their *entire, unweeded* volumes as never deviating from that correctness and purity which should be the inseparable attendant on the tragic muse. In how many of the favorite tragedies of Rowe and Otway do we find passages calculated to awaken those very passions which it was the professed object of the author to counteract,

> "First raising a combustion of desire,
> With some cold moral they would quench the fire."

The earliest dramatic exhibitions in England were miracle plays or "mysteries." They are so called because they taught the mysterious doctrines of Christianity and represented the miracles of the first founders of the faith, of the saints and martyrs. They frequently introduced allegorical characters, such as Charity, Sin, Death, Hope, Faith, etc. and finally, plays were formed consisting entirely of such characters—These were called "moralities." These plays were monstrous combinations of piety and absurdity, of Scripture narratives and lying legends. They are not only characterized by what an enlightened age would call impiety and irreverence, but frequently polluted by gross and open obscenities. "In one play of the Old and New Testament," says Warton, "Adam and Eve are both exhibited on the stage naked and conversing about their nakedness: this very pertinently introduces the next scene in which they have coverings of fig leaves. This extraordinary spectacle was beheld by a numerous assembly of both sexes with great composure." These "mysteries" were at first exhibited in the monasteries and churches,— afterwards in the universities and at court. The practice of acting plays in the churches became so offensive and troublesome that in the reign of Henry VIII, Bonner issued a proclamation to the clergy of his diocese, prohibiting "all manner of common plays games or interludes to be played, set forth or declared within their churches, chapels," etc. These miracle plays and moralities contained the rudiments of the English drama. It is probable that the frequent occurrence of pageants and processions, shown on civil occasions, accompanied with great pomp and splendid decorations, first suggested the idea of introducing *profane* characters into the drama.

From this hybridous union of monkish piety and courtly revels, with the assistance of the numerous tribe of mimics, jugglers, dancers, tumblers, musicians, mummers, maskers and minstrels that thronged the palaces of nobles and kings, during the middle ages, arose the "*splendid fabric*" of the English drama.

Warton has expressed an opinion that plays on general subjects were no uncommon mode of entertainment in the royal palaces of England, at least in the commencement of the fifteenth century. Notwithstanding the patronage extended to players by nobles and kings, the profession soon

became disreputable. In an old poem published A. D. 1509, we find them classed as follows,

> 'Chimney swepers and costerd mongers,
> Lode men and bere brewers,
> Fyshers of the see and muskel takers,
> Schovyl chepers, gardeners and rake fetters,
> *Players*, purse cutters, money batterers,
> Golde washers, tomblers and jogelers,' etc.

In 1572, itinerant performers had become so numerous and troublesome that a statute was enacted against them, ranking "juglers, pedlers, tinkers, bearwards, common *players* and *minstrels* together as *rogues and vagabonds.*" But through the influence of royal patronage in encouraging men of talent, and the liberality of the wealthy in building theatres, there was a progressive improvement in dramatic exhibitions. At the commencement of the 17th century there were no less than eleven regular playhouses in London and the insipid productions of Edwards and Whetstone soon yielded the stage to the real genius of Greene and Marlowe, and after them to Shakspeare. Though the stage was thus rescued from disgrace it was not purged of its immoralities. Even in the days of its glory, it still exhibited traces of its impure origin. The splendid moral sentiments which adorn the pages of Shakspeare are probably rather the reflection of the virtuous morals of his age than the dictates of his own heart; for there is little doubt that the author himself was a libertine in principle and practice. We may safely conclude that he was fond of the pleasures of tavern life from the manner in which he treats intemperance. He ever treats it as a venial fault and makes the follies and crimes of inebriates rather subjects of pleasantry than censure. For proof of this, we need only refer to the characters of Prince Hal, and Falstaff. Concerning the general character of his works a distinguished English writer remarks, "The plays of this most unequal of all poets contain so much that is vulgar, so much that is absurd and so much that is impure; so much indecent levity, false wit, and gross description, that he should only be read in parcels, and with the nicest selection. His more exceptionable pieces should not be read at all."

The morality of the stage depends in a great measure upon the morality of the age. A licentious community will not tolerate a virtuous drama or patronise a virtuous author.

Hence the drama generally, represents the prevailing manners of the age. Authors who write for their bread must please their employers.

> "The drama's laws the drama's patrons give;
> For they that live to please, must please to live."

The reign of Charles II. is well known as a period of uncommon licentiousness. Charles himself was an abandoned profligate. He squandered millions upon harlots and parasites. Drunkenness and impurity were then the honored badges of loyalty. Baxter says, "not only seriousness but even temperance and chastity were signs of non-conformity and prognostics of rebellion; and the nation in spite of God's judgments seemed ripening for the doom of Sodom." Other writers confirm these statements. Neal, in his history of the Puritans says, "There were two play-houses erected in the neighborhood of the court. Women actresses were introduced into the theatres, which had not been known before; the most lewd and obscene plays were brought on the stage; and the more obscene the better was the king pleased. Nothing was to be seen at court but feasting, hard drinking, revelling and amorous intrigues, which engendered the most enormous vices." The manners of the court were imitated by the common people and impiety and debauchery became the prevailing characteristics of the age. The wits of the age were generally leaders in these infamous practices, and those authors whose private life was free from stain, prostituted their talents to please the court. Such was Dryden. His works contain many examples of dissolute licentiousness furnished not from inclination but *in way* of *trade*. He bartered away his innocence for bread. Hear the comment of the great "English Moralist" upon it. "Of the mind that can trade in corruption and can deliberately pollute itself with ideal wickedness for the sake of spreading the contagion in society, I wish not to conceal or excuse the depravity. Such degradation of the dignity of genius, such abuse of superlative abilities cannot be contemplated but with grief and indignation." Dryden lived to repent of his folly but could not atone for the mischief he had done. Dramatic writers, since the days of Dryden, have neither improved in manner, matter nor morals. Wycherly appears to have been a handsome libertine with a tolerable share of impudence

and conceit joined to other qualities of a more agreeable and captivating nature. The perusal of the works of Congreve, says Johnson, "will make no man better. Their ultimate effect is to represent pleasure in alliance with vice, and to relax those obligations by which life ought to be regulated." This criticism would apply equally well to most of the productions of the English drama from the reign of Charles II. to the present time. Sheridan was one of the most popular writers and orators during the reign of George the third. His School for Scandal and another of his comedies are said to have been received with unbounded applause, at the two most celebrated theatres in London, on the very night when he made his celebrated speech against Warren Hastings. This unrivalled orator, wit and dramatist, was notoriously dissolute and intemperate, and his character is stamped upon his productions. Wraxhall says of him, "at the age of thirty-three he was at the height of his popularity. It might be said of his aspect as Milton does of the fallen angel's form,

> ——'His face had not yet lost
> All its original brightness.'—

Excess of wine had not degraded its lineaments, eclipsed its fine expression, covered him with disgusting eruptions, and obtained for him the dramatic nickname of Bardolph. At sixty, he reminded me of one of the companions of Ulysses, who having tasted of Circe's charmed cup, instantly

> ——'lost his upright shape
> And downward fell into a groveling swine.'"

At the present time the popularity of theatrical exhibitions is waning. The gay, the fashionable and dissolute are seeking other sources of excitement. Novel reading has been in a great measure substituted for the theatre. This species of amusement, or rather, "beggarly day dreaming," as it is called by Mr. Coleridge, is one of very questionable moral influence. When we prefer novel-reading to theatre-going, we do but choose the less of two acknowledged evils. There are honorable exceptions, however, to this remark, both among the early and later novelists. The novels of Richardson, which were the reigning entertainment of the last century, but now obsolete, contain more

maxims of virtue and sound moral principle than many books called moral. On the other hand, the popular novels of Fielding and Smollet, which still maintain their popularity with the reading world, are polluted with language unpardonably gross and disgusting and with descriptions suited only to the brothel and dram-shop. The reader is thus *amused* at the expense of delicacy and virtue. Hannah More says, in one of her letters, "I never saw Johnson really angry with me but once; and his displeasure did him so much honor that I loved him the better for it. I alluded rather flippantly to some witty passage in Tom Jones; he replied, I am shocked to hear you quote from so vicious a book. I am sorry to hear you have read it; a confession which no modest lady should ever make. I scarcely know a more corrupt book." Sir Walter Scott, who has probably laid a heavier tax upon the time and money of the reading community than any other author that ever lived, furnishes a tolerably safe amusement to those who aim at nothing higher and would seek something worse, if not thus employed, not because he says so much in favor of virtue, but because he says so little in favor of vice.

The authoress quoted above says of his poetry and fictitious works, "I am far from putting Byron and Walter Scott on a level; the one is an anti-moralist indeed, but surely I may say the other is a non-moralist."

But let us leave the drama and novels and pass to the consideration of Lyric Poetry, which is one of the strong holds of popular vices both in ancient and modern literature, because it is the store-house of popular feelings and sympathies. Fletcher did not speak unadvisedly when he said, "Let me make the songs of a people and you may make its laws." With the intemperance of Grecian lyrics the name of Anacreon is intimately associated. A debauchee in opinion and practice, his summum bonum was sensual pleasure. "Wine was alike the inspiration of his muse, his love and his joy." Yet vile as he was he has been the idol and pattern of many a *Christian* poet. Cowley, in his eulogy upon Anacreon, says:

> "*Had I the power of creation*
> My creatures should be all like thee,
> 'Tis thou should'st their idea be:
> They, like thee, should thoroughly hate
> Business, honor, title, state.

Wisdom itself they should not hear
When it presumes to be severe;
They should not love yet all or any
But very much and very many.
All their life should gilded be
With mirth and wit and gaiety."

Cowley died of a fever caught by lying under a hedge all night, in a fit of intoxication. But the sentiments of the inebriate still live and breathe in his songs.

The writings of Anacreon betray the systematic toper. He laughs at gray hairs and wrinkles, and revels on the verge of the grave. The premonitions of death and present cares were with him only incentives to mirth and inebriation. His object was present enjoyment. He says,

To-day I'll haste to quaff the wine
As if to-morrow ne'er would shine;
But if to-morrow comes, why then
I'll haste to quaff my wine again.
For death may come with brow unpleasant,
May come when least we wish him present
And beckon to the sable shore,
And grimly bid us *drink* no more.

But Anacreon was a heathen and ignorant of higher and better hopes, mistook the road to happiness through the flowery paths of pleasure. Let us hear the inspirations of the Christian Burns:

Here's a bottle and an honest friend,
What wad ye wish for mair?
Who kens, before his life may end,
What his share may be of care?
Then catch the moments as they fly
And use them as ye ought,
Believe me, happiness is shy
And comes not ay when sought.

The sensualist, Anacreon, vainly thought wine a remedy for wo; he says,

Man of sorrow, drown thy thinking,
Grasp the bowl in nectar sinking,
Oh let us quaff the rosy wave
Which Bacchus loves, which Bacchus gave,
And, in the goblet rich and deep,
Cradle our crying woes to sleep.

Compare him again with the "divine Burns" whose pleasing strains are the solace of the aged and delight of the young:

Gie him strong drink until he wink
That's sinking in despair;
An' liquor guid to fire his bluid,
That's press'd wi' grief and care;
There let him bouse and deep carouse
Wi' bumpers flowing o'er;
Till he forgets his loves and debts
An' minds his griefs no more.

Again addressing his favorite drink, he says,

Thou clears the head of doited Lear;
Thou cheers the heart of drooping care;
Thou strings the nerves of labor sair
At's weary toil,
Thou even brightens dark despair
Wi' gloomy smile, etc.

In respect to Anacreon, it seems that he was not actually so vicious as his writings represent him to be, for the severe and moral Plato condescends to call him the "wise Anacreon," and Athenæus distinctly mentions him as "sober and honorable." But all the biographers of Burns acknowledge that he was the slave of intemperance. Moreover, it should be recollected in reading translations of bacchanalian songs from the ancients, that one half the charms of vice that hover about them are the legitimate offspring of the translator's corrupt imagination. This remark may be illustrated by comparing the literal translation of one of the most exceptionable odes of Anacreon with the poetic colorings of Moore. The following is the literal version. "The black earth drinks and the trees drink; the sea also drinks the breezes; and the sun the sea, and the moon drinks the sun; why do ye contend with me, O companions, when I myself have a mind to drink?"

Now follows Moore's translation.

Observe when mother Earth is dry
She drinks the droppings of the sky;
And then the dewy cordial gives
To every thirsty plant that lives.
The vapors which at evening weep
Are beverage to the swelling deep;
And when the rosy sun appears
He drinks the ocean's misty tears,
The moon too quaffs her paly stream
Of lustre from the solar beam,
Then hence with all your sober thinking
Since natures holy law is drinking,
I'll make the law of nature mine,
And pledge the universe in wine.

Who but an amateur inebriate, a wine-bibber by profession, could have magnified this simple ditty of the Greek poet into such a magnificent, universal drinking song? What imagination, unless fired with wine and swollen by its vapors, would ever conceive of a drunken universe? There is quite as much difference between the thoughts of Moore and those of Anacreon as there would be between the ancient author himself, in his simple unornamented costume, and the modern exquisite who has paraphrased his verses.

Admitting, however, that the lyrics of Anacreon are as corrupt as they are represented to be, the student who seeks an acquaintance with this department of ancient literature is not obliged to read them. The spotless page of Pindar alone will furnish him a competent knowledge without the least taint of impurity.

Roman lyric poetry is perhaps more objectionable, on the ground of its pernicious tendency, than that of the Greeks. Roman lyric poets imitated the voluptuous bards of Greece in their amatory and convivial effusions. English poets have gathered poisonous flowers from both these gardens to weave a wreath for their own brows. In some instances they have surpassed their teachers in delicacy of language, and always in voluptuousness of thought. We cannot quote passages from modern writers in proof of this assertion, lest by turning the attention of the young reader to the charms of these seductive songs, we should increase the very evil we would guard them against. Both the ancient Epicureans and their modern imitations exhort to sensual enjoyment from the brevity of life and the approach of death.

"The ungodly" says the Wisdom of Solomon, reason with themselves, but not aright: "Our life is short, our time is a very shadow that passeth away—and, after our end, there is no returning. Come on, therefore, let us enjoy the good things that are present, and let us speedily use the creatures like as in youth. Let us fill ourselves with costly wine and ointments, and let no flower of the spring pass by us; let us crown ourselves with rose-buds before they be withered. Let none of us go without his part of our voluptuousness; let us leave tokens of our joyfulness in every place; for this is our portion and our lot in this world."

Among the Latin poets there is no passage which exhibits a more perfect specimen of this voluptuous and pensive Epicureanism than the following from Catullus.

"Vivamus, mea Lesbia, atque amemus,
Rumoresque senum severiorum
Omnes unius æstimemus assis," etc.

'Let us live while we may
And love while we can,
And the scorn spurn away
Of censorious man,'

is a summary of the morality of Roman lyric poets whose genius has immortalized their own vices. Their morality was the morality of the age. This laxity of principle arose from the prevalence of the Epicurean philosophy, which, by corrupting the morals and destroying the manly energies of the nation was greatly instrumental of its ruin. Horace, that prince of lyric poets, has exposed himself to the charge of licentiousness and intemperance by writing for the tastes of a vicious people and humoring the inclinations of a profligate court. Though he has many redeeming traits and has, throughout his works, inserted many excellent moral reflections and some maxims showing the value of temperate habits, still we cannot but lament that, with the good, he has mingled so much that is unpardonably gross and licentious.

But should we, as the opponents of the classics recommend, throw aside ancient literature on account of its tendency to promote intemperance and other vices, and make an indiscriminate use of modern literature, should we be gainers by the exchange? The whole body of our popular literature is corrupt, and no moralist can recommend the "*unweeded*" volumes of popular writers to the young student. In its infancy, it was baptized in the filthy waters of sensual indulgence. Its very originators were parasites and libertines. They lived by flattering the vices of the great whom in these respects, they faithfully imitated. In the understages of society the offices of the poet and musician, the singer and the actor were united and represented by a single character. "The aoidoi and rhapsodoi of Greece," says Turner, "the citharœdi of the Romans, the bards of Wales, the harpers and gleemen of the Saxons, and the Northern scalds were all itinerant performers who combined the arts of poetry, music, singing and gesticulation." These strolling minstrels were in a great measure the originators of the early literature of their respective nations, and, of course, left the impress of their own characters upon it. The Anglo Saxon harpers were the retainers of kings and

nobles. They feasted at their master's table and followed him to the battle field. They celebrated, in song, his exploits in war and the revels of the banquet hall. It may not be uninteresting to add a description of a royal feast, by an Anglo Saxon poet, who having borrowed the outlines of the story from the Apocrypha has applied the manners and characters of his day to the time of Judith and thus really made it an Anglo Saxon romance.

"Then was Holofernes
Enchanted with the wine of men:
In the hall of the guests
He laughed and shouted,
He roared and dined,
That the children might hear afar
How the sturdy one
Stormed and clamored;
Animated and elated with wine."

Mr. Turner adds, "We have a list of the liquors used at a great Anglo Saxon festival in a passage of Henry of Huntington. They were wine, mead, ale, pigment, morat and cider. The pigment was a sweet and odoriferous liquor, made of honey, wine and spices of various kinds. The morat was made of honey diluted with the juice of mulberries." After the Norman conquest, intemperance in eating and drinking was characteristic of the barons and their retainers. The courts of princes swarmed with ministrels, players and buffoons, whose regular salaries and expensive living exhausted the treasury of the nation. The minstrels were the principal literary characters of the times, until the clergy were induced to write poetry. Thus living in idleness and voluptuous ease, their number increased; and they, like many of the pensioned wits of a subsequent age, copying the vices of the court, became so dissolute and abandoned that in the reigns of Edward I. and Elizabeth they were made the subjects of penal enactments being described as "rogues, vagabonds and sturdy beggars." The first drinking ballad in our language, which has been thought worth preserving appeared in 1551. It commences as follows,

'I cannot eat but little meat,
My stomach is not good;
But sure I think, that I can drink
With him that wears a hood.'

The last stanza but one reads

> 'Now let them drink, till they nod and wink,
> Even as good fellows should do:
> They shall not miss to have the bliss
> Good ale doth bring men to.'

This song opens the second act of "Gammer Gurton's Needle," one of the oldest comedies extant in our language. This fact again reminds us of the reciprocal influence of the drama and intemperance.

These merry minstrels who are branded by the ecclesiastics and historians of the times, as "Antichrist," "haunters of taverns," "tutors of idleness," etc., disappeared about the time of Elizabeth; and, their "merry minstrelsie" and "losels tales" which "did make their hearers, in taverns, to drink," afterwards gained but little notoriety either of praise or infamy. About this time, there arose a splendid constellation of literary men, whose works are still read with undiminished pleasure and probably will continue to be read down "to the last syllable of recorded time." Yet amid all their excellence we find many other things, which, like the impurities of amber, are "neither rich nor rare," embalmed in the very language genius has chosen in which to clothe its everlasting thoughts. Some of these defects have already been alluded to, in our notice of the dramatic literature of that age. As learning was not then, generally, diffused among the people, literary men, with the exception of dramatists, could not expect a support from the public. Authors, therefore, who possessed neither rank nor wealth depended, entirely, upon the patronage of nobles and princes. It was fashionable, at that time, for courtiers to encourage intemperate habits both by their example and by the provision they made for their dependents. The parsimonious Queen, indirectly, encouraged this laxity of morals by feasting at the expense of her nobles. She was accustomed, frequently, to visit her nobility when she and her numerous attendants, retainers, parasites, poets and players were splendidly entertained. These carousals sometimes continued for several weeks in succession. At one of these entertainments probably the most magnificent of the kind ever attempted, given by the Earl of Leicester at Kenilworth Castle, "one of the items of consumption by the populace was three hundred and sixty five hogsheads of beer." "This species of hospi-

tality," says Hume, "was the source of vice, disorder, sedition and idleness." The pensioned wits and literary parasites of the age caught the infection and many of them became abandoned profligates. Anthony Wood who lived in the age of Charles II. alludes with great severity to "the vices of the poets" and the grossly immoral habits of the literary men of his own and the preceding age. Of one, he says, "he wrote to maintain that high and loose course of living which poets generally follow," of another, who was perhaps the most celebrated wit of the age of Charles II. he remarks, being naturally inclined to excess of pleasure and mirth, dissolute men for some years heightened his spirts (inflamed with wine) into one almost uninterrupted fit of wantonness and intemperance. In short, we may, with justice, say of the productions of many of the poets of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries what one of the boon-companions of "rare Ben Johnson" said of a work of his,

> How could that poem heat and vigor lack,
> *When each line of't cost Ben a cup of sack.*"

The age of Queen Anne was somewhat improved though still distinctly marked with the same vices. The papers of Addison and Steele abound in the discussion of principles which are now taken for granted, and the avowed object of these essays was the reformation of popular vices. Yet Steele and Addison taught morals better by precept than example, for Steele was notoriously intemperate; and Addison, says his biographer, was fond of the pleasures of tavern life and destroyed his constitution by habitual excess in wine. Prior, another celebrated poet of that age was said to be fond of low pleasures and ale-house companions. We are told by Spence also that "he cohabited with a despicable drab of the lowest species." Pope being naturally of a feeble constitution could not bear the excitement of the convivial entertainment which the literati of the age so freely indulged in. Yet some of his minor poems betray a polluted imagination and exhibit greater wantonness and indecency than the works of his less temperate associates. The biographer of Sterne says, "we may collect from his correspondence that without much warmth of heart he was a decided sensualist." All his works bespeak the unprincipled libertine though sometimes concealed beneath the sacred surplice. He was

undoubtedly more solicitous about the gratification of his own pleasures than the welfare of mankind. Thompson preferred the transient pleasures of the voluptuary to the quiet of domestic life. He was a decided sensualist. Johnson could practice *abstinence* but not temperance. "Many a day," says Boswell, "did he fast, many a year refrain from wine; but when he did eat it was voraciously; when he did drink it was copiously." "Poor Goldsmith" was dissipated, but his follies injured none but himself. The same may be said of Thompson and Johnson. These three last named authors deserve the gratitude of mankind that they did not suffer their private vices to poison the well spring of human sympathies nor make their own undying thoughts the vehicle of intemperance and sensuality. Would that their successors had imitated their example. Many of the most admired poems of a more recent date are redolent with the fumes of wine. Byron often drank his inspiration from the bottle. His Don Juan is the offspring of lust and inebriation, and its sentiments are fit only for the dram shop and the brothel. Some of the most spirited productions of Charles Lamb were penned in the very delirium of intoxication. Let us in imagination, for a moment, look in upon this charming favorite of the muses as he is finishing one of his delightful essays. See him, at midnight, shrouded in tobacco smoke with one hand grasping a pen and the other a drinking glass, with a bottle in front; and after sipping his favorite beverage, hear him exclaim, "must I then leave you gin, rum, brandy, aqua vitæ, pleasant jolly fellows? Hang temperance and him that first invented it." Let his biographer now explain the enigma. "Drinking with him except so far as it cooled a feverish thirst was not a *sensual* but an *intellectual* pleasure. It lighted up his fading fancy; enriched his humor and impelled the struggling thought or beautiful image into day." It is a pity that intemperate authors should have their boon companions for their biographers, who either positively commend their vices or apologise for them. Thus the influence of their crimes is not only perpetuated by their works but by their eulogists.

Perhaps it may be said that this exposure of the vices of literary men diminishes our respect for men of genius and dishonors those whom we wish to admire and love. D'Israeli in his "Quarrels of Authors," has furnished us with a perti-

nent reply: "This chapter is not honorable to authors—but it may be useful; and that is a quality not less valuable to the public. It lets in their readers to a kind of knowledge, which opens a necessary comment on certain works, and enlarges our comprehension of their spirit." Besides, we wish to know the character of those with whom we associate. When Byron died, the *libertine* did not die. He still lives and his works have given to him a sort of ubiquity. He is now the intimate associate of thousands who might never have heard his name had he not written "Don Juan." Were that accomplished libertine bodily present, in every family where his licentious poetry is now read with all the fascination of manners, brilliancy of wit, sprightliness of conversation and seductive arts of intrigue that characterized him while living, his influence would scarcely be increased. He has embodied his infamous principles in his works. He has thrown around them the charms of sentiment, of wit and of eloquence. The living voice and captivating manner of the author could scarcely render them more seductive. Here, the solitary student and the modest maiden may become acquainted with the nobleman without the formalities of an introduction. Impelled by a desire for forbidden knowledge they receive, from his hand, the proffered volume, and like the monarch in Eastern story, inhale death while they turn the poisoned pages.

When Burns died the drunkard did not die.—He still lives, and by his admired songs, commending strong drink and good fellowship, whispers encouragement to many a hesitating student as he first takes his seat in the social circle. Burns is still the life and soul of many a convivial party and many a toper, who never heard the name of Burns, has joined in the chorus

> "We'll take a cup of kindness yet,
> For auld lang syne."

In conclusion, let us revert once more, to the comparatively feeble influence of ancient literature in respect to intemperance and licentiousness. The student who seeks corruption as his element may undoubtedly find it in the compass of ancient literature. Few, however, have the diligence to *seek* it there, when they can find it more to their taste in their vernacular tongue. "It is not" says an American writer, "the man who keeps Homer, Sophocles and Virgil upon his table, in whose

bosom one might expect to see the foulness and damp of impurity, but he who has neither industry to learn nor elevated feeling to appreciate the productions of such minds, and who finds his *lazy level* in communion with the corrupting novels of Fielding or the poetry of Byron and Moore." The licentious poetry of antiquity is generally too gross and the drinking songs too insipid to excite the jaded appetite of the inebriate or inflame the passions of the sensualist, till dressed out in a modern suit. It is not probable that any student's imagination was ever fired and his drooping spirits roused for a drunken revel by reading the "Nunc est bibendum" of Horace, as they are by the delicate and insinuating address of that "*sentimental fool*" Tom Moore (as he is significantly named by the author of the Puritan):

> "Friend of my life this wine cup sip,
> 'Twill chase away thy care," etc.

or that other drinking song of Campbell:

> "Drink ye to her that each loves best," etc.

Such sentiments are committed to memory by the student, and are garnered in the store-house of the soul as the choicest flowers of poesy, "*the beauties*" of these admired authors. There, like a slow poison, they sap the moral constitution and gradually introduce moral death.

Licentiousness when dressed in the simple costume of antiquity has comparatively little to kindle unhallowed emotions, but, "tricked out in the tawdry finery of modern sensualism, with all the meretricious ornaments of a *refined* voluptuousness, it easily attracts the attention of the unsophisticated, decoys the unwary, and steals upon the prudent even in retirement." Thus the mind of the reader is debased, his imagination polluted, his passions inflamed, his appetites vitiated, and his soul *ruined*.

ARTICLE III.

The Land of Goshen, and the Exodus of the Israelites.

By Edward Robinson, D. D., Prof. Bib. Lit. New-York Theol. Sem., New-York.

To the Editor of the Biblical Repository:

Dear Sir,

In the number of the Biblical Repository for Oct. 1832, Vol. II. p. 743, sq., there is an article by me on the Land of Goshen, and the miraculous passage of the Red Sea by the Israelites. That article was prepared with the best helps which were then accessible, particularly the Travels of Niebuhr and Burckhardt; and I am not aware that any better than these are yet extant. But having been permitted to visit the country in question in the spring of 1838, in company with the Rev. Eli Smith, the same subject naturally claimed a first place among the objects of our attention. We both entered upon the inquiry, I believe, with a sincere and earnest desire to arrive only at the truth; without regard to the opinions of former travellers, or our own previous views. We could have no other wish or interest, than to serve the cause of truth. The reader will find in the present article, that the result of our investigations led only to a stronger conviction of the general correctness of my former view. Indeed, the nature of the country, and the circumstances of the case, are so marked, that I hardly think any candid person *acquainted with the whole subject*, who should view the Red Sea and the adjacent country on the spot, would find it possible to come to any other conclusion.

The following pages comprise an extract from the account of our Journey, which will not be published for several months to come. Whoever chooses to compare this article with the former one, will not be slow, I think, to perceive the difference between the report of an eyewitness and that of a mere compiler. E. R.

Berlin, Oct. 9th, 1839.

Thursday, March 15th, 1838. Our encampment for the last night was in the valley between Jebel 'Aweibid and the western ridges of 'Atâkah. We first descended along the valley, which after a time takes the name of Wady Emshâsh. At 9h. 15′ we left it, taking a course E. S. E. around a small hill called el-Muntŭla', and down a narrow pass, which was formerly considered dangerous. The pass gradually opens, and we had a glimpse of 'Ajrûd. We thought too that the Red Sea lay in sight before us; but it turned out to be only the *mirage*. At the foot of the pass, and near 'Ajrûd, we dismounted from our camels, and ascended a hill on the right, from which we had a wide prospect over the plain into which the pass opens, the fortress of 'Ajrûd on the left, and Suez on the right in the S. E. with the Red Sea beyond. The atmosphere to-day seemed specially adapted to produce the *mirage;* for as we looked towards Suez it seemed wholly surrounded by water; while lakes and ponds apparently extended from the sea far up from the shore upon the desert plain. This plain, which we now overlooked, is not far from ten miles square, extending with a gentle slope from 'Ajrûd to the sea west of Suez, and from the hills at the base of 'Atâkah to the arm of the sea N. of Suez. But it retains the same general character as the desert we had passed. Hills and mountains and the long narrow strip of salt water were indeed around and before us; but not a tree, nor scarcely a shrub, and not one green thing was to be seen in the whole circle of vision.

'Ajrûd is the next station on the Haj route after Dâr el-Hŭmra. It is a fortress with a well of bitter water two hundred and fifty feet deep,* built for the accommodation and protection of the pilgrims on their way to and from Mecca. Near by it is a mosk with a saint's tomb, also enclosed with walls. The fortress stands on the S. side of Wady Emshâsh, along which on the north a range of low hills stretches from W. to E. The Haj route passes by the

---

* Burckhardt's Travels in Syria, etc., p. 628. Edrîsi mentions 'Ajrûd about the middle of the 12th century. Rüppell singularly enough writes the name *Hadgi Routh;* Reise in Abyssinien, I. p. 135. The Arabic orthography has been fixed at least ever since the days of Edrîsi.

castle on the south, and continues its course directly towards the mountains which lie E. of the line of the Gulf, and constitute the ascent to the high plain of the eastern desert. Two summits were pointed out to us, between which the road passes on towards 'Akabah; the northern one called Mukhsheib, and the southern er-Râhah, as belonging to the more southern chain of that name.

Before reaching 'Ajrûd our road separated from that of the Haj, turning more S. E., and we passed the fortress at 11h. 40′, leaving it about twenty minutes distant on our left. From 'Ajrûd to Suez is reckoned four hours. Crossing the plain, which is every where intersected by water-courses, we came at 2h. 50′ to Bîr Suez, one hour from the town. Here are two deep wells, surrounded by a square massive building of stone, with towers at the corners, erected in the seventeenth century, as appears from an inscription. The water is brackish, and is carried to Suez on asses and camels only for cooking and washing; being too salt to be drank. Even where it flows upon the ground round about the building, it produces no vegetation, causing only a saline efflorescence. In Niebuhr's time the water was drawn up by hand,* but is now raised by wheels turned by oxen, and runs into a large stone trough outside, where animals drink and water-skins are filled. Here our camels were watered for the first time. They had been fed in Cairo with green clover; and had not drank, it was said, for twelve days before our departure. Yet they now drank little, and some of them none at all.

We reached Suez (Arabic *Suweis*) at 3. 50′, and pitched our tent outside of the walls, on the north of the town, near the shore: having first reconnoitered the interior and found no spot so clean and convenient among all its open places; to say nothing of the annoyance and risk to which we should have been exposed from idlers. From the gate of Cairo to Suez we reckoned 32¼ hours of march; equivalent to 64½ geogr. miles, or somewhat less than 75 English miles. Our whole time, including the stops at night, was 71⅓

* Reisebeschr. I. p. 217. These would seem to be the wells mentioned by Edrîsi under the name el-'Ajûz, between 'Ajrûd and Kolzum; p. 329, ed. Jaubert.

hours or nearly three whole days. The India mails had just before been carried across in twenty-two hours; and the Pasha is said to have once crossed on horseback in thirteen hours, by having relays of horses stationed on the way.

We paid our respects to the English Vice-consul, Mr. Fitch, to whom we had letters; and of whose kindness we retain a grateful remembrance.* He had been only five weeks in the place; and his chief business was the agency for the Bombay steamers, which were to arrive and depart every month. At his invitation we attended his *soirée*, where, however, we met only three other persons, and these in his employ. They were three brothers Manueli, natives of the place, and members of the Greek Church. One of them, Nicola, had been for many years English Agent at Suez, until recently superseded by the Vice-consul, under whom he now acted as Dragoman and fac-totum. We found him to be a very intelligent and well-informed man, and obtained from him satisfactory information on many points of inquiry connected with this region. At the suggestion of the Vice-consul, he procured for us a letter from the Governor of Suez to the Governor of 'Akabah; which, however, we found to be of little importance.

Suez is situated on the angle of land between the broad head of the Gulf, the shore of which here runs nearly from E. to W., and the narrow arm which runs up northward from the eastern corner of the Gulf. It is poorly walled on three sides; being open to the water on the E. or rather N. E., where is the harbor and a good quay. Here were lying quite a number of the Red Sea craft, vessels of considerable size, with neat white bottoms, but with only one mast and sail, and no deck except over the cabin. The timber and materials for all vessels built here, have usually been brought from the Nile on camels.† Within the walls are many open places, and several khans built around large courts. In the large open space connected with the building occupied by the consulate, a beautiful tame gazelle was running about, belonging to the Governor, whose house was

---

* This gentleman died a year afterwards at Alexandria.

† Niebuhr Reisebeschr. I. p. 218. Compare Wilkin's Gesch. der Kreuzzuge, III. ii. p. 223.

adjacent to the same court. The houses in general are poorly built. There is a bazar, or street of shops, which we found tolerably furnished with provisions and stuffs, mostly from Cairo. The inhabitants consist of about twelve hundred Mohammedans, and one hundred and fifty Christians, of the Greek Church.—The geographical position of Suez is in lat. 29° 57′ 30″ N., long. 30° 11′ 09″ E. from Paris.*

The transit of the productions and merchandise of the East from the Red Sea to the Nile, has always made this an important point, and caused the existence of a city in the vicinity; though Suez itself, as a town, is of modern origin, and has been greatly aided by the concourse of pilgrims who annually embark here for Mecca. The present arrangements for making it the point of communication between Europe and India by means of steam navigation on the Red Sea, may probably give to it an impulse, and somewhat enlarge its population; but it can never become any thing more than a mere place of passage, which both the traveller and the inhabitant will hasten to leave as soon as possible. The aspect both within and without is too desolate and dreary. Not a garden, not a tree, not a trace of verdure, not a drop of fresh water! all the water with which Suez is supplied for personal use, being brought from the fountain Nâba', three hours distance across the Gulf, and so brackish as to be scarcely drinkable.

About ten minutes, or one third of a mile north of the town, is a lofty mound of rubbish, in which a few substructions are visible, and frequent fragments of pottery. It is called Tell Kolzum. This is doubtless the site of the former city Kolzum, so often mentioned by Arabian writers, as the port where fleets were built on the Red Sea. It was the successor of the Greek Klysma; Kolzum being merely the Arabic form of the same name.† The earlier city of Arsi-

---

* So Berghaus, as a mean deduced from many observations. See his Memoir zu seiner Karte von Syrien, pp. 28, 29.

† Klysma (*Κλύσμα*) is mentioned in this place by Cosmas Indicopleustes so late as about A. D. 530. See Montfaucon's Collectio nova Patrum, T. II. p. 194. In the Council of Constantinople A. D. 553, the name of Stephanus Bishop of Clysma appears among the signers; see in Harduin Acta Concilior. III. p. 52. For Kolzum, see Edrisi Geogr. I. pp. 331, 333, ed.

noe or Cleopatris is supposed to have stood somewhere in the vicinity; and may perhaps have occupied the same spot.

The Gulf of Suez, as seen from the adjacent hills, presents the appearance of a long strip of water, setting far up like a large river, through a desert valley of twenty or thirty miles in width, the shores skirted sometimes by arid plains, and sometimes interrupted by naked mountains and promontories on either side. The whole configuration reminded me strongly of the valley of the Nile on a larger scale; except that there the noble river bears fertility on its bosom and scatters it abroad in lavish profusion; while here desolation reigns throughout. The Gulf becomes narrower towards Suez, and terminates in a line of coast extending from the town westward nearly to Jebel 'Atâkah, a distance of six or eight miles. Further south, this mountain runs quite down to the sea, forming a promontory called Râs 'Atâkah; beyond which opens the broad mouth or plain of Wady Tawârik, and then follows Jebel Deraj or Kulâlah, and the long chain of African mountains. On the east side of the Gulf, the parallel ridge of mountains, called er-Râhah, is here twelve or fifteen miles distant from the coast. Around the head of the Gulf, extensive shoals stretch out southward far into the sea, and are left bare at low water; except a narrow winding channel like a small river, by which light vessels come quite up to the town. We saw these shoals twice while the tide was out. They extend a mile and a half or two miles below Suez, are quite level and hard, thinly covered with sea-weed, and composed apparently of sand mingled perhaps with coral. We saw persons walking upon them quite near the southern extremity. Larger vessels and the steamers lie off in the road below these shoals, more than two miles distant from the town.

The desert plain back of Suez, which has been mentioned above as extending west as far as to 'Atâkah, and north to 'Ajrûd, is composed for the most part of hard gravel; and is apparently of no recent formation, but as old as the adjacent hills and mountains. Just at Suez a narrow arm of water runs up northward for a considerable distance from the N. E. corner of the Gulf; in which, when we saw it, the

---

Jaubert. Abulfeda in Busching's Magazin, IV. p. 196. Compare also Bochart's Phaleg. II. c. 18.

water extended up about two miles; but the depression or bed of it continues beyond the mounds of the ancient canal, and as far as the eye can reach. Opposite Suez this arm is about eleven hundred and fifty yards wide, according to Niebuhr;* but higher up and opposite Tell Kolzum it is broader, and has several low islands or sand-banks, which are mostly covered at high water. It is here and around the northern part of this arm, that there are evident traces of a gradual filling up of this part of the Red Sea. I am not aware of any circumstances which go to show that the *level of the sea* itself has ever been changed; but the change, if any, has been brought about solely by the drifting in of sand from the northern part of the desert plain, which here extends to the eastern mountains. This plain is ten miles or more wide. Burckhardt crossed it in 1812 in six hours from the wells of Mab'ûk at the foot of the mountains to the mounds of the canal; and says it was full of "moving sands which covered the plain as far as he could discern, and in some places had collected into hills thirty or forty feet in height."† Such it was as we also saw it on our left, in passing around the head of the bay; and this sand, driven by the strong N. E. wind which often prevails, is continually carried towards and into the water, and the process of filling up is still going on. There can be little room for doubt, that the islands above Suez were formed in this manner; since in former days vessels probably lay at Kolzum, which they now cannot reach. Around the head of the inlet, there are also obvious indications, that the water once extended much further north, and probably spread itself out over a wide tract towards the east. The ground bears every mark of being still occasionally overflowed; and our Arabs said it was often covered by the sea, especially in winter, when the S. winds prevail. The soil of this part is a fine sand like that of the adjacent desert, only rendered more solid by the action of the waves. In some parts it was covered with a saline crust, and occasionally exhibited strips of shells. Whether the shoals south of Suez were formed in the same manner, it is more difficult to decide; though they would seem now to have a firmer consistence.

---

* Reisebeschr. I. p. 253. † Travels in Syria, etc. p. 754.

We were told that the tide rises at Suez and upon these shoals about *seven* English feet. According to the French measurements, the average rise of the tides in their time was 5½ Paris feet, though it sometimes exceeded 6 feet. Niebuhr found it to be only 3½ feet.* It must obviously vary much with the direction of the wind; since a strong wind from the northern quarter would have the effect to drive the tide out and prevent its return; while a south wind would produce the contrary results. Opposite Suez there is a ferry; and higher up, at Tell Kolzum, a ford, which is sometimes used at low water, leading over two of the sandy islands. Niebuhr's guides passed this ford on foot, and the water came scarcely up to their knees.† An island just below the ford is called *Jezîrat el-Yehûdiyeh*, or "Jews' Island;" but although we inquired particularly we could not learn that the ford itself is called *Derb el-Yehûd*, or Jews' Road, as reported by Ehrenberg.‡ There is also another ford south of Suez, near the edge of the shoals, where a long narrow sand-bank extends out from the eastern shore. Here at low tides the Arabs sometimes wade across the channel; the water being then about five feet deep; or, as it was said, coming up to the chin.

The road which we travelled from Cairo to Suez is the shortest and most direct of all between those two points, and like all the rest (except the southern one), is wholly destitute of water as far as to 'Ajrûd. On the Besâtîn route west of Jebel Gharbûn are the shallow pits of Gandali (or Gandelhy), in which a small quantity of tolerable water collects. On the more southern and longer branch of this route through Wady Tawârik, is the well of 'Odheib (sweet water), near the shore S. of Râs 'Atâkah, about eight hours from Suez. Here is also a small mound of rubbish with fragments of pottery, indicating a former site. But the shortest route of all between Suez and the borders of the Nile, lies to the northward of all these roads, and passes nearer to the valley of the ancient canal. Caravans proceeding from Suez in this direction, stop the first night at Rejûm el-Khail, a mere station in

* Le Père in Descr. de l'Eg. Et. Mod. I p. 90. Niebuhr Beschr. von Arab. p. 421.

† Reisebeschr. I. p. 252.

‡ See his Map in Naturgesch. Reisen Abth. I. Berlin, 1828.

the desert without water; and the next day reach Râs el-Wâdy, a considerable village on the border of Wady Tûmilât, some distance N. E. of Belbeis. This Wady is the western part of the broad valley of the canal, which more to the eastward is called Wady Seba' Biyâr (Seven Wells). The water of the Nile flows up into it during the annual inundation, sometimes as far as to the salt lakes Temsah (Crocodile Lakes) as marked on the maps; which lakes indeed are said on the great French map to have water only at these periods. This circumstance of course renders the valley a tract of fertile land on which are scattered many villages and traces of ancient sites. By taking a direction more to the right from Rejûm el-Khail, a days' journey brings the traveller to the well of . bu Suweirah situated in the northern part of the same great Wady, a little N. W. of the Crocodile Lakes.* A more direct course from Suez to the latter place, is prevented by salt marshes, into which the camels sink. Our Arabs, who had themselves been this route and gave us this information, said these marshes were made by a canal cut thus far from the Red Sea and then neglected; though now a hill (as they said) separates them from the sea. These are doubtless the well-known marshes or Bitter Lakes of the ancients, which the French found to be from forty to fifty feet (12 to 15 metres) below the usual level of the Gulf of Suez; while the broad tract of sand which now separates them from the Gulf is only about three feet above the same level. A higher bank or swell of ground at their western extremity separates them in like manner from the Crocodile Lakes, and forms the utmost limit of the inundations of the Nile.†

The bearing of the preceding details upon one of the most

* See Letter of Rev. E. Smith, Bib. Repos. II. pp. 748, 749, Oct., 1832.

† Rozière in Descr. de l'Egypte. Antiq. Mem. I. p. 137. Le Père and Du Bois-Aymé, ib. Et. Mod. I. p. 21, sq., 187, sq. Compare Ritter's Erdkunde, Th. II. 1818, p. 232, sq. A valuable abstract of the results contained in the great French work, is given by Mr. Maclarin in the Edinburgh Philosophical Journal, 1825, vol. XIII. p. 274. There are however doubts as to the accuracy of the French measurements.

remarkable events of Biblical history, will be obvious; I mean the Exodus of the Israelites and their passage through the Red Sea. I propose to bring together in this place all I have to say on this subject: premising such information as we were able to obtain relative to the Land of Goshen, and the probable route of the Israelites on leaving Egypt.

We were quite satisfied from our own observation, that they could not have passed to the Red Sea from any point near Heliopolis or Cairo in three days, the longest interval which the language of the narrative allows. Both the distance and the want of water on all the routes, are fatal to such an hypothesis. We read, that there were six hundred thousand men of the Israelites above twenty years of age, who left Egypt on foot.* There must of course have been as many women above twenty years old; and at least an equal number both of males and females under the same age; besides the "mixed multitude" spoken of, and very much cattle. The whole number therefore probably amounted to two and a half millions; and certainly to not less than two millions. Now the usual day's march of the best appointed armies, both in ancient and modern times, is not estimated higher than fourteen English, or twelve geographical miles;† and it cannot be supposed that the Israelites, encumbered with women and children and flocks, would be able to accomplish more. But the distance on all these routes being not less than sixty geographical miles, they could not well have travelled it in any case in less than five days.

The difficulty as to water might indeed have been obviated so far as the Israelites were concerned, by taking with them a supply from the Nile, like the caravans of modern days. But Pharaoh appears to have followed them upon the same track, with all his horses and chariots and horsemen; and this could not have taken place upon any of the routes be-

---

* Ex. xii. 37, 38. Comp. Num., i. 2, 3, 45, 46, where a year later the number is given at 603,550.

† Rennell's Compar. Geogr. of Western Asia, I. p. 54. I am informed by Prussian officers of rank, that the usual march of their armies is three German miles a day, equal to twelve geographical miles, of sixty to the degree. Forced marches are reckoned at five German miles a day. In either case the whole army rests every fourth day.

tween Cairo and the Red Sea. Horses are indeed often taken across at the present day; but then a supply of water must be provided for them; usually about two water-skins for each horse. Six of these water-skins are a load for a camel; so that for every three horses, there must be a camel-load of water. Still they not unfrequently die; and we saw the carcasses of several which had perished during the recent passage of the Haj. Flocks of sheep and goats might pass across; but for neat cattle this would be impossible, without a like supply of water.

Land of Goshen.

The preceding considerations go far to support the usual view of scholars at the present day, that the Land of Goshen lay along the Pelusiac arm of the Nile, on the east of the Delta, and was the part of Egypt nearest Palestine.* This tract is now comprehended in the modern province esh-Shrŭkîyeh, which extends from the neighborhood of Abu Za'bel to the sea, and from the desert to the former Tanaitic branch of the Nile; thus including also the valley of the ancient canal. If the Pelusiac arm, as is commonly assumed, were navigable for fleets in ancient times, the Israelites were probably confined to its eastern bank; but if we are at liberty to suppose that this stream was never much larger than at present, then they may have spread themselves out upon the Delta beyond it, until restrained by larger branches of the Nile. That the Land of Goshen lay upon the waters of the Nile, is apparent from the circumstance, that the Israelites practised irrigation; that it was a land of seed, figs, vines, and pomegranates; that the people ate of fish freely; while the enumeration of the articles for which they longed in the desert, corresponds remarkably with the list given by Mr. Lane as the food of the modern Fellahs.† All this goes to

* The usual arguments from Scripture and the early writers, on which this opinion rests, may be found in Rosenmueller's Bibl. Geogr. III. p. 246, sq. Gesenius' Thesaur. Ling. Heb. p. 307. Bibl. Repos. Oct. 1832, p. 744. A view of the various earlier theories respecting the position of Goshen is given in Bellermann's Handb. der Bibl. Literatur IV. p. 191. Gesenius l. c.

† Deut. xi. 10, Num. xx. 5, Num. xi. 5, "We remember the

show, that the Israelites, when in Egypt, lived much as the Egyptians do now; and that Goshen probably extended further west and more into the Delta than has usually been supposed. They would seem to have lived interspersed among the Egyptians of that district, perhaps in separate villages, much as the Copts of the present day are mingled with the Mohammedans. This appears from the circumstance of their borrowing "jewels of gold and silver" from their Egyptian neighbors; and also from the fact, that their houses were to be marked with blood in order that they might be spared in the last dread plague of the Egyptians.*

The immediate descendants of Jacob were doubtless nomadic shepherds like their forefathers, dwelling in tents; and probably drove their flocks for pasture far up in the Wadys of the desert, like the present inhabitants of the same region. But in process of time they became also tillers of the soil, and exchanged their tents for more fixed habitations. Even now there is a colony of the Tamarah Arabs, about fifty families, living near Abu Za'bel, who cultivate the soil and yet dwell in tents. They came thither from Mt. Sinai about four years before the French invasion. This drove them back for a time to the mountains of the Terâbîn E. of Suez; but they had acquired such a taste for the good things of Egypt, that like the Israelites they could not live in the desert, and soon returned after the French were gone. Now, said our Arabs, though we acknowledge them as cousins, they have no right to dwell among us: nor could they live in our barren mountains after enjoying so long the luxuries of Egypt.

The Land of Goshen was "the best of the land;"† and such too the province of the Shŭrkîyeh has ever been, down to the present time. In the remarkable Arabic document

---

fish we did eat in Egypt freely; the cucumbers and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlic." Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, I. p. 242. "Their food consists of bread made of millet or of maize, milk, new cheese, eggs, small salted fish, cucumbers and melons, gourds of a great variety of kinds, onions and leeks, beans, chick-peas, lupins," etc. etc.

* Ex. xi. 2, xii. 12, 13, 22, 23, etc.

† Gen. xlvii. 6.

translated by De Sacy,* containing a valuation of all the provinces and villages of Egypt in the year 1376, the province of the Shŭrkiyeh comprises 383 towns and villages, and is estimated at 1,411,875 *dinars*—a larger sum than is put upon any other province, with one exception. During my stay in Cairo, I made many inquiries respecting this district; to which the uniform reply was, that it was considered as the best province in Egypt. Wishing to obtain more definite information, I ventured to request of Lord Prudhoe, with whom the Pasha was understood to be on a very friendly footing, to obtain for me, if possible, a statement of the valuation of the provinces of Egypt. This, as he afterwards informed me, could not well be done; but he had ascertained that the province of the Shŭrkiyeh bears the highest valuation and yields the largest revenue. He had himself just returned from an excursion to the lower parts of this province, and confirmed from his own observation the reports of its fertility. This arises from the fact that it is intersected by canals; while the surface of the land is less elevated above the level of the Nile, than in other parts of Egypt; so that it is more easily irrigated. There are here more flocks and herds than any where else in Egypt; and also more fishermen. The population is half migratory, composed partly of Fellahs and partly of Arabs from the adjacent deserts and even from Syria; who retain in part their nomadic habits, and frequently remove from one village to another. Yet there are very many villages wholly deserted, where some fifty thousand people might at once find a habitation. Even now another million at least might be sustained in the district; and the soil is capable of higher tillage to an indefinite extent. So too the adjacent desert, so far as water could be applied for irrigation, might be rendered fertile; for wherever water is, there is fertility.

Route of the Israelites to the Red Sea.

From the land of Goshen, as thus defined, to the Red Sea, the direct and only route was along the valley of the ancient canal. The Israelites broke up from their rendezvous at Rameses "on the fifteenth day of the first month, on the mor-

* Abdallatif's Relation de l'Egypte, par De Sacy, p. 583, sq.

row after the passover;* and proceeded by Succoth and Etham to the sea. Without stopping to inquire as to the identity of Rameses with Heröopolis, or the position of the latter place, it is enough for our purpose, that the former town (as is generally admitted) lay probably on the valley of the canal in the middle part, not far from the western extremity of the basin of the Bitter Lakes. Nor is it necessary to discuss the point, whether this basin anciently formed a prolongation of this arm of the Red Sea, as is supposed by some; or, as is more probable, was covered with brackish water, separated from the Red Sea, as now, by a tract of higher ground. Nothing more is needed for our present purpose, even admitting that a communication existed from this basin to the sea, than to suppose that the inlet, if any, was already so small, as to present no important obstacle to the advance of the Israelites.

From Rameses to the head of the Gulf, according to the preceding data, would be a distance of some thirty or thirty-five miles, which might easily have been passed over by the Israelites in three days. A large portion of the people were apparently already collected at Rameses, waiting for permission to depart, when the last great plague took place. From the time when Pharaoh dismissed Moses and Aaron in the night of the fourteenth day of the month (according to the Jewish reckoning) until the morning of the fifteenth day, when the people set off, there was an interval of some thirty hours, during which these leaders could easily reach Rameses from the court of Pharaoh, whether this were at Memphis, or as is more probable, at Zoan or Tanis.†

The first day's march brought them to Succoth, a name signifying "booths," which might be applied to any temporary station or encampment. Whether there was water here is not mentioned; and the position of the place cannot be determined. On the second day they reached Etham, "in the edge of the wilderness."‡ What wilderness? The Israelites after passing the Red Sea are said in Exodus to have gone three days' march into the desert of Shur; but in Numbers

---

* Ex. xii. 37; Num. xxxiii. 3.

† The Psalmist places the scene of the miracles of Moses in the region of Zoan; Ps. lxxviii. 12, 43.

‡ Ex. xiii. 20; Num. xxxiii. 6.

the same tract is called the desert of Etham.* It hence follows, that Etham probably lay on the edge of this eastern desert, perhaps not far from the present head of the Gulf, and on the eastern side of the line of the Gulf or canal. May it not have stood upon or near the strip of land between the Gulf and the basin of the bitter Lakes ?† At any rate, it would seem to have been the point from which the direct course of the Israelites to Sinai would have led them around the present head of the Gulf and along its eastern side. From Etham they "turned" more to the right; and instead of passing along the eastern side, they marched down the western side of the arm of the Gulf, to the vicinity of Suez. This movement, apparently so directly out of their course, might well give Pharaoh occasion to say, "they are entangled in the land, the wilderness hath shut them in;" and lead him to pursue them with his horsemen and chariots, in the hope of speedily overtaking and forcing them to return.‡

The position of Migdol, Pi-haheroth, and Baal-Zephon, cannot of course be determined, except that they probably were on or near the great plain back of Suez. If the wells of 'Ajrûd and Bîr Suez were then in existence, they would naturally mark the sites of towns; but there is no direct evidence either for or against such an hypothesis. That this point, so important for the navigation of the Red Sea, was already occupied by a town, perhaps Baal-Zephon, is not improbable. A few centuries later several cities lay in the vicinity; and these must have had wells, or there were more fountains than at present. In the plain, the Israelites would have abundant space for their encampment.

Passage of the Red Sea.

The question here has respect to the part of the sea where the passage took place, which many writers and travellers have assumed to be the point at the mouth of Wady Tawârik, south of Râs 'Atâkah, principally perhaps because it was

---

* Ex. xv. 22; Num. xxxiii. 8.

† This view would be supported by the Egyptian etymology which Jablonski assigns to the name Etam, viz. ATIOM, border of the sea.

‡ Ex. xiv. 2, 3, sq.

supposed that the Israelites passed down that valley. But according to the preceding views, this could not well have taken place; and therefore, if they crossed at that point, they must first have passed down around Râs 'Atâkah and encamped in the plain at the mouth of the valley.

The discussion of this question has often been embarrassed, by not sufficiently attending to the circumstances narrated by the sacred historian; which are, in the main points, the following. The Israelites, hemmed in on all sides,—on their left and in front the sea, on their right Jebel 'Atâkah, and behind them the Egyptians,—began to despair of escape, and to murmur against Moses. The Lord now directed Moses to stretch out his rod over the sea; and the Lord caused the sea to flow (Heb. *go*) by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea dry, and the waters were divided. And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry (ground); and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left. The Egyptians pursued and went in after them; and in the morning watch, the Lord troubled the host of the Egyptians. And Moses stretched out his hand over the sea, and the sea returned to his strength when the morning appeared, and the Egyptians fled against it; and the waters returned and covered all the host of Pharaoh.*

In this narration there are two main points, on which the whole question may be said to turn. The first is, *the means* or instrument with which the miracle was wrought. The Lord, it is said, caused the sea to go (or flow out) *by a strong east wind.* The miracle therefore is represented as mediate; not a direct suspension or interference with the laws of nature; but a miraculous adaptation of those laws to produce a required result. It was wrought by natural means supernaturally applied. For this reason, we are here entitled to look only for the natural effects arising from the operation of such a cause. In the somewhat indefinite phraseology of the Hebrew, an east wind means any wind from the eastern quarter; and would include the N. E. wind, which often prevails in this region. Now it will be obvious, from the inspection of any good map of the Gulf,† that a strong N. E. wind,

* Ex. xiv. 11, 12, 21—28.

† Especially Neibuhr's Tab. xxiv. in his Reschr. von Arabien.

acting here upon the ebb-tide, would necessarily have the effect to drive out the waters from the small arm of the sea which runs up by Suez, and also from the end of the Gulf itself, leaving the shallower portions dry; while the more northern part of the arm, which was anciently broader and deeper than at present, would still remain covered with water. Thus the waters would be divided, and be a wall (or defence) to the Israelites on the right hand and on the left. Nor will it be less obvious from a similar inspection, that in no other part of the whole Gulf, would a N. E. wind act in the same manner to drive out the waters. On this ground, then, the hypothesis of a passage through the sea opposite to Wady Tawârik, would be untenable.

The second main point has respect to the interval of *time* during which the passage was effected. It was night; for the Lord caused the sea to go (out) *all night;* and when the morning appeared, it had already returned in its strength; for the Egyptians were overwhelmed in the morning watch. If, then, as is most probable, the wind thus miraculously sent acted upon the ebb-tide to drive out the waters during the night to a far greater extent than usual, we still cannot assume that this extraordinary ebb, thus brought about by natural means, would continue more than three or four hours at the most. The Israelites were probably on the alert, and entered upon the passage as soon as the way was practicable; but as the wind must have acted for some time before the required effect would be produced, we cannot well assume that they set off before the middle watch, or towards midnight. Before the morning watch, or two o'clock, they had probably completed the passage; for the Egyptians entered after them, and were destroyed before the morning appeared. As the Israelites numbered more than two millions of persons, besides flocks and herds, they would of course be able to pass but slowly. If the part left dry were broad enough to enable them to cross in a body one thousand abreast, which would require a space of more than half a mile in breadth, (and is perhaps the largest supposition admissible,) still the column would be more than two thousand persons in depth; and in all probability could not have extended less than two miles. It would then have occupied at least an hour in passing over its own length, or in entering the sea; and deducting this from the largest time intervening

before the Egyptians must also have entered the sea, there will remain only time enough, under the circumstances, for the body of the Israelites to have passed at the most over a space of three or four miles. This circumstance is fatal to the hypothesis of their having crossed from Wady Taw rik; since the breadth of the sea at that point, according to Niebuhr's measurement, is three German or twelve geogr. miles, equal to a whole day's journey.*

All the preceding considerations tend conclusively to limit the place of passage to the neighborhood of Suez. The part left dry might have been within the arm which sets up from the gulf, which is now two thirds of a mile wide in its narrowest part, and was probably once wider; or it might have been to the southward of this arm, where the broad shoals are still left bare at the ebb, and the channel is sometimes forded. If similar shoals might be supposed to have anciently existed in this part, the latter supposition would be the most probable. The Israelites would then naturally have crossed from the shore west of Suez in an oblique direction, a distance of three or four miles from shore to shore. In this case there is room for all the conditions of the miracle to be amply satisfied.

To the former supposition, that the passage took place through the arm of the gulf above Suez, it is sometimes objected, that there could not be in that part space and depth enough of water, to cause the destruction of the Egyptians in the manner related. It must however be remembered, that this arm was anciently both wider and deeper; and also, that the sea in its reflux would not only return with the usual power of the flood-tide, but with a far greater force and depth, in consequence of having been thus extraordinarily driven out by a N. E. wind. It would seem moreover to be implied in the triumphal song of Moses on this occasion, that on the return of the sea, the wind was also changed, and acted to drive in the flood upon the Egyptians.† Even now caravans never cross the ford above Suez; and it is considered dangerous, except at quite low water.‡

---

* Neibuhr's Reisebeschr. I. p. 251.

† Ex. xv. 10; comp. verse 8.

‡ In 1799, Gen. Bonaparte in returning from 'Ayûn Mûsa attempted the ford. It was already late and grew dark; the

Our own observation on the spot led both my companion and myself to incline to the other supposition, viz. that the passage took place across shoals adjacent to Suez on the south. But among the many changes which have taken place here in the lapse of ages, it is of course impossible to decide with certainty as to the precise spot; nor is this necessary. Either of the above suppositions satisfies the conditions of the case; on either, the deliverance of the Israelites was equally great, and the arm of Jehovah alike gloriously revealed.

ARTICLE IV.

On the Geology of Palestine, and the Destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.

By Charles A. Lee, M. D. Late Prof. of Mat. Med. and Medical Jurisprudence in the University of New-York.

To the Editor of the Biblical Repository:

Sir:

I was much interested in the article of Prof. Robinson, in the last No. of the Biblical Repository, "*On the Dead Sea, and the Destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.*" The facts therein detailed, serving as they do, to throw additional light both on Scripture history, and the geological features of the most interesting country on the face of the globe, must be considered as of the highest importance, and cannot fail to arrest the attention, not only of the naturalist and philosopher, but also of the Biblical student. It is a legitimate object of inquiry, what were the means employed by the Almighty in the destruction of the guilty cities of the plain; and since this catastrophe is represented in Scripture,

---

tide rose, and flowed with greater rapidity than had been expected; so that the general and his suite were exposed to the greatest danger; although they had guides well acquainted with the ground. See Note of Du Bois-Aymé, Descr. de l'Egypte, Antiq. Mem. I. p. 127, sq.

as the result of a combination of Divine agency and natural and secondary causes, I propose, in the present essay, to inquire what these causes were. While I do this, however, I wish to be understood as admitting, to the fullest extent, the special agency and interposition of the Deity in the event.

In your notice of the late excellent geological work of the Rev. J. Pye Smith, D. D., (page 243), you have justly remarked, that "it is the usage of the sacred writers to speak of the operations of the Deity in the natural world, in language adapted to the opinions which were generally prevalent among the people to whom the revelation was made," and hence infer, that Scripture references to natural objects would be in such style as comported with the knowledge of the age in which they were delivered. Believing this rule to be a correct one, I shall endeavor, in the remarks I am about to offer, to shape my views and suggestions in consonance with it, and in no case, to propose theories, which cannot be reconciled with this principle of exegesis.

Before proceeding however to a consideration of the main object of our inquiry, it will be necessary to examine at some length the geological features of Palestine, in order to a correct understanding and appreciation of the views which will afterwards be presented.

Geology of Palestine.

Palestine, it is well known, is a hilly and in many places a mountainous country; extending about 150 miles in length from north to south, having Syria and the lofty ridges of Lebanon on the north, the Mediterranean on the west, and the Arabian desert on the east and south.* Judea, which is chiefly situated between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean, is a high country, rising by successive terraces from a shore that is in many places bold and lofty. Its principal eminences are Carmel, Bashan, and Tabor, which are not bleak and rugged heights, but covered with luxuriant woods, pastures, and vineyards. In the neighborhood of the Dead Sea, however, south-east from Jerusalem, there are extensive, high and desolate tracts; the surface being broken by deep and dreary glens, and hemmed in by lofty precipices,

* Encyclopedia of Geography, Vol. II. p. 254.

which exclude the sun. Between the Jordan and Jerusalem, extend the flat plains of Jericho, 20 miles in length and 10 in breadth; walled in on every side by the high mountains of Judea and Arabia. The shores of the Dead Sea and the valley to the north of it, consist of an expanse of salt, dry mud, and moving sand.

Limestone rocks are the most abundant formation in Palestine. They form the chief mountain ranges in Syria, and are of a whitish color, and very hard, and sonorous when struck with a hammer. Extending south, they surround Jerusalem, stretching to the river Jordan on the one side, and to the plain of Acre and Jaffa on the other. Numerous caverns abound in this rock, as they do in every country; to which we find frequent allusions in Scripture. One, near Damascus, is said to be large enough to contain ten thousand men. Mt. Seir is composed of limestone, though detached masses of basalt and large quantities of breccia, formed of sand and flint, abound in its vicinity. The valley of Asphaltites is underlaid by fetid limestone, i. e. limestone impregnated with sulpharous and bituminous particles; which is extensively manufactured in the east into amulets, and worn as a specific against the plague. That a similar superstition respecting this stone existed, in very early ages, appears from the circumstance, that charms made from it, have lately been found in the subterranean chambers under the pyramids of Sakhara, in Upper* Egypt. The fetid properties of this rock are ascertained to be owing to the presence of sulphuretted hydrogen; as all bituminous limestone does not possess this property. The hills along the Mediterranean coast, extending several miles back, are composed of a soft chalky substance, (carbonate of lime,) containing a great variety of shells, corals, and other marine organic remains. Near Beyrout, upon the Castravan Mountains, extensive deposits of the fossil remains of fishes are found, in a state of the most perfect preservation; so that the minutest portions of the fins and scales are clearly distinguished.† Chalk beds occur on the heights of Carmel, containing numerous flint nodules, embodying petrifactions of different kinds. Some specimens bear a close resemblance to the olive, and are

* Palestine, by Rev. Michael Russel, D. D. p. 306.

† Shaw's Travels.

called "*lapides Judaici*;" these are regarded by the inhabitants, when dissolved in lemon-juice, as a specific for curing the stone and gravel.* Volney states, that he traced the limestone formation through the whole extent of Syria, particularly between Antioch and Aleppo and Hama; that it forms the greater part of Lebanon, Anti-Lebanon and the mountains of the Druses, Galilee, Mt. Carmel, and the ridges which stretch to the south of the Dead Sea; that the houses in Palestine are built with it, and lime manufactured from it; that, in the upper regions of Lebanon it contains no petrifactions, but, that near the sea, it abounds with the remains of plants, fish, shells, and sea-animals.† Volney also discovered small *volutes* and *bivalves* in a "heavy, porous and salt stone" in the bed of the torrent of Azkalon, in Palestine, and Pococke observed them on the borders of the Dead Sea.‡

Granitic rocks are met with to considerable extent in Palestine, and, according to some travellers, the loftiest peaks that surround the lake Asphaltites are of this formation. Mt. Sinai is unquestionably a member of this group, and so also are the hills which run up on each side of the Arabian Gulf. Mt. Hor and Wady Mousa are composed of rocks belonging to the new red sandstone formation; and it is from this rock, that all the temples and tombs of Petra have been excavated.§ It extends, in all probability, through the whole length of the valley of El Ghor, and passes into quartz rock, or a fine siliceous sandstone, which caps the summits of the neighboring cliffs, giving them a highly grotesque and fantastic appearance. The sides of the cliffs lining this valley, are often perpendicular, presenting alternating strata of calcareous rocks, sandstone and quartz, lying over each other in horizontal layers. "Nowhere," says Irby, "is the extraordinary coloring of these mountains more striking than in the road to the tomb of Aaron, which we followed, where the rock sometimes presented a deep, sometimes a paler blue, and sometimes was occasionally

* Travels or Observations relating to several parts of Barbary and the Levant. Vol. II. p. 153.

† Volney's Travels in Syria, Egypt, &c. Vol. I.

‡ Pococke's Travels.

§ Burckhardt's Travels.

streaked with red, or shaded off to blue or purple; sometimes a salmon color was veined in waved lines and circles, with crimson and even scarlet, so as to resemble exactly the color of raw meat; in other places, there are lined stripes of yellow or bright orange, and in some parts all the different colors were ranged side by side in parallel strata; there are portions also with paler tints, and some quite white, but these last seem to be soft, and not good for preserving the sculpture. It is this wonderful variety of colors observable throughout the whole range of mountains, that gives to Petra one of its most characteristic beauties; the facades of the tombs, tastefully as they are sculptured, owe much of their imposing appearance to this infinite diversity of hues in the stone."*

Mt. Sinai is a granitic rock. In many places it presents blackened perpendicular cliffs of from 600 to 800 feet in height. *Porphyry* and *greenstone* are found among the lower ridges of the mountains, passing into *slate*. According to Burckhardt, the porphyry contains red *feldspar* and small crystals of *hornblende*, with rose-colored *quartz* and *mica*, united by an argillaceous cement. The granite, however, is chiefly of the fine-grained species; an immense block of which forms the summit of Mt. St. Catharine. In some places, as at Tabakat, the same traveller observed large slabs of feldspar, traversed by veins of white and rose-colored quartz.†

The valleys in the neighborhood of Mt. Sinai are principally underlaid with beds of *limestone*, though the *white and red sandstone* often crop out upon the sides of the hills. Igneous rocks, or those of a volcanic origin, are also met with in various parts of Palestine. At Akaba, the extremity of the eastern branch of the Red Sea, a perpendicular wall of *trap rocks* lines the shore; and near Sherm, further south, Burckhardt traced the same *basaltic* formation for a distance of two miles, the cliffs being perpendicular, formed in half, or sometimes nearly whole circles, and from 60 to 80 feet in height. In some places, he observed appearances of *volcanic craters*. The rocks are black; or slightly tinged with red, full of cavities, and rough; and the surface cov-

* Irby & Mangles' Travels, pp. 438, 9.

† Burckhardt's Travels.

ered with deep layers of sand. Volney states that "the south of Syria, through which the Jordan flows, is a country of volcanoes, " and that the *bituminous* and *sulphurous* waters of the Lake Asphaltites, the *lava* and *pumice* stones upon its banks, and the *thermal* springs of Tubaria, prove that this valley has been the seat of a subterranean fire not yet extinguished."*

Between Cana and Turan, near the Jordan, and a few miles north of the Dead Sea, Dr. Clarke discovered numerous *basaltic* columns of regular prismatic form, like those of Staffa, or the Giant's Causeway. They penetrate the surface of the soil, and by their gradation in the order of steps, or a stair-case, form a series of successive plains in approaching the Lake of Tiberias.† In descending to Tiberias, Dr. Clarke found the soil black, which he attributes to the decomposition of volcanic rocks : the stones, scattered over the surface, were *amygdaloidal* and porous; their cavities being occasionally occupied by *mesotype*, or by plumose *carbonate of lime*. On the shore of the Lake of Tiberias, he also found pieces of a porous rock, resembling *toad-stone*, with cavities filled with crystals of *zeolite*. *Native gold* was formerly discovered in the same vicinity.‡ Hasselquist informs us that the hill of Tiberias, from which issue the fountains whence the baths are supplied, is composed of " a black and brittle *sulphurous stone*," which is only found in considerable masses in that neighborhood, though it is very often met with in rolled specimens on the shores of the Dead Sea, and in other parts of the valley.§ This was probably a species of *bituminous shale*, containing *sulphur*, as it often does. Near the town of Tiberias are situated the celebrated thermal, or hot baths of Emmaus. These waters are mentioned by Pliny and Josephus, and were formerly in great repute, for their salubrious qualities. In relation to them Pliny remarks, "Aboccidente Tiberiade, aquis, callidis, salubri."‖ Pococke analyzed the water and found it to contain "gross fixed *vit-*

* Volney's Travels in Syria, Egypt, &c.

† Clarke's Travels, in Greece, Egypt, and the Holy Land, Vol. IV. p. 272.

‡ Reland Palæst. Illust. Tom. II. p. 1042.

§ Hasselquist's Travels.

‖ Pliny (Hist. Nat. lib. v. c. 15.)

riol, some *alum* and a mineral *salt*."* Monconys, quoted by Reland, states that the water is extremely hot, having a taste of *sulphur*, mixed with *nitre*. Egmont and Heyman describe its quality as resembling that of the springs of Aix la Chapelle, "so hot as not easily to be endured," and "so salt as to communicate a brackish taste to that of the lake near it." Volney relates that "for want of cleaning, it is filled with a black mud, which is a genuine *Æthiops Martial*," and that "persons attacked by rheumatic complaints, find great relief, and are frequently cured by baths of this mud."† These statements are confirmed by Hasselquist, who says that "the water deposits a black sediment like paste, smelling strongly of sulphur, and is covered by two pellicles, one of a green, the other of a rusty color;" the former being probably *petroleum*, and the latter an *oxide of iron*.

Near the western shore of the Dead Sea, Dr. Clarke states that he saw a mountain, "resembling, in its form, the cone of Vesuvius, near Naples, having a crater upon its top, which was plainly discernible."‡ Malte Brun remarks that "the valley of the Jordan offers many traces of *volcanoes;* the bituminous and sulphurous water of Lake Asphaltites, the lavas and pumice thrown out on its banks, and the warm baths of Tabariah, show that this valley has been the theatre of a fire not yet extinguished; volumes of smoke are often observed to escape from the lake, and new crevices are found on its margin."§ Maundrell, who is at all times worthy of the most implicit belief, relates that "when he arrived within half an hour of the Dead Sea, he found the ground uneven, and varied into hillocks, much resembling those places in England where there have been ancient *lime-kilns;*" that "the Dead Sea is enclosed by very high mountains," and that on "the shore of the lake he found a black sort of pebbles, which, being held in the flame of a candle, soon burn and yield a smoke of an intolerable stench, losing only of its weight, but not of its bulk by burning." "The hills bordering on the lake," he observes, "abound with this sort of sulphurous stones," and he saw pieces of it two feet square,

* Pococke's Description of the East, Vol. II. p. 69.
† Travels in Egypt and Syria, Vol. II. p. 230.
‡ Clarke's Travels, Vol. II. p. 374.
§ Malte Brun's Geography.

carved in *basso relievo*, and "polished to as great an extent as black marble is capable of."* Dr. R. R. Madden, a very intelligent English physician, and the same gentleman who lately testified at New Haven, in the case of the Amistad prisoners, observes that "the face of the mountains and of the country surrounding the Dead Sea, has all the appearance of a volcanic region; and having resided for some years at the foot of Vesuvius, having visited Solfatara, Ætna, and Tromboli, I was tolerably conversant with volcanic productions. I have no hesitation in saying, that the sea which occupies the sites of Sodom and Gomorrah, Adma, Seboim, and Segor, covers the *crater of a volcano*. I must confess I found neither *pumice-stone* nor genuine black *lava*, but the soil was covered with white porous stone and red veined *quartz*, which had decidedly undergone combustion. At Ghor, *native sulphur* is found in considerable quantities beneath the soil; the inflammable *asphaltum*, which forms a pellicle over the surface of the water on the western shore, arises from fissures in the rock on the opposite beach. On coming out of the water, I found my body coated with it, and likewise with an incrustation of salt about the thickness of a sixpence. At the northern extremity, the sea is fordable; and here, the Arabs of Saba inform me, that there are hot springs bubbling up in the middle of the *Bahr Luth*, or Sea of Lot, as they call the Dead Sea. That species of phosphoric stone which is found in Tuscany, on the supposed site of a volcano, is found on the eastern side. I found large quantities of the *fetid lime-stone*, called *stink-stone*, on the western mountains; the recent fracture produces a strong smell of *sulphuretted hydrogen*. The basis of all the western shore is a *calcareous rock* mixed with *silex*. Two feet below the sandy surface of the earth, I found a stratum of *red-veined quartz;* and below another stratum of *lime-stone*, a vein of reddish earth. Many of these substances are only found in volcanic countries; at all events the rugged aspect of the mountains, the terrible ravines on either shore, the uncouth forms of the jagged rocks, all prove that the surrounding country has been the scene of some terrible convulsion of

* A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem at Easter, 1697, by Henry Maundrell, M. A. p. 112.

nature."* The hills around Medina, in Arabia, Burckhardt considered as decidedly of volcanic origin, being of a bluish black color, very porous, yet heavy and hard, containing small white granules of other minerals. He describes the whole plain as blackened by the *debris*, by which it is overspread. The inhabitants informed him, that "in the 13th century an earthquake and volcanic eruption were experienced in that region, and that an immense black mass, resembling a city, with walls, battlements and minarets, burst forth east of the town, ascending towards heaven with a smoke that blackened the sky." Numerous thermal springs are found along the road to Mecca, and between Syria and Yemen. According to Ali Bey, there are seven groups of volcanic hills near Jedeida in Arabia, of a black color, and resembling picturesque ruins.† Several islands in the Red Sea have the same character. Near Suez Burckhardt found *petroleum* springs, which furnished large quantities of this mineral oil for purposes of commerce; it being carried to Egypt, where it is extensively employed as a remedy for rheumatism and sores.‡ Numerous specimens of petrified date trees were also found in this vicinity, some 20 or 30 feet in length, and ten inches in diameter.

The Dead Sea.

A geological sketch of Palestine requires a more extended description of this celebrated sheet of water. It is called in Scripture the "*Sea of the Plain*," (Deut. 3 : 17,) the "*Salt Sea*," (Deut. 3 : 17,) the "*East Sea*," (Ezek. 47 : 18,) from its situation relative to Judea; and by Josephus and the Greek and Latin writers generally, *Lacus Asphaltites*, from its supposed bituminous properties. In modern times, it has received the name of the *Dead Sea*, from a tradition that no living creatures can exist in its waters. The Arabs call it *Bahar Loth*, or the Sea of Lot; it also is known in Syria by the name of *Almotanah;* and occupies the southern extremity of the vale of Jordan, extending about 70 miles in length, and 20 in breadth at its broadest part. Near its

* Travels in Turkey, Egypt, Nubia, and Palestine, by R. R. Madden, p. 212.

† Ali Bey's Travels in Asia Minor.

‡ Burckhardt's Travels.

southern extremity is a ford, mentioned by Prof. Robinson, about six miles over, near the middle of which are warm springs. *Chemical analysis* has dispelled whatever of mystery there has been in respect to the nature of the waters of this lake, and we now know that it is very similar to the waters of saline springs, especially of those in volcanic districts. According to the analysis of the late Dr. Gordon, it contains of

Muriate of Lime,	3.920	per cent.
Muriate of Magnesia,	10.246	"
Muriate of Soda,	10.360	"
Sulphate of Lime,	0.054	"
	24.580	

A bottle of water brought home by Dr. Madden, and analyzed, yielded, of

Chloride of Sodium,	9.58	per cent.
Chloride of Magnesium,	5.28	"
Chloride of Calcium,	3.05	"
Sulphate of Lime,	1.34	"
	19.25	

The saline matter amounts, therefore, to 19.25 per cent., besides containing a trace of *Bromine ;* a new substance lately discovered, by M. Balard, in the waters of the Mediterranean, and since, by the late Dr. Turner, in those of the Frith of Forth. According to Mr. Lyell, a hot spring rises through granite, at Saint Metaire, in Auvergne (France) in the region of the extinct volcanoes, which contains a large proportion of *Muriate of Soda*, with *Magnesia* and other ingredients, closely resembling the water of the Dead Sea.* Many springs in Sicily possess similar properties ; and some of the brine springs of Cheshire (England), of this State,† and of the valley of the Mississippi, are also very analogous in their

* Lyell's Geology, Vol. I. p. 209.

† There is a small lake two miles east of Manlius Centre, about 20 rods south of the Erie Canal in the State of New-York, which is called *Lake Sodom*. The water tastes like the Harrowgate waters. This is supposed by some geologists, to be the crater of an ancient volcano.

composition. "The waters of the Dead Sea," says Lyell, "contain scarcely any thing except *Muriatic Salts*, which lends countenance, observes Dr. Daubeny, to the volcanic origin of the surrounding country, these salts being frequent products of volcanic eruptions."* Pococke had a bottle of the waters of the Dead Sea analyzed, the result of which was similar to those above given. In 1778, Messrs. Lavoisier, Macquer and Sage, repeated the analysis, and found that 100 lbs. of water contained 45 lbs. six ounces of saline and earthy ingredients. Its specific gravity is 1.211, that of fresh water being 1000. It is perfectly transparent, contains no *Alumine* nor *Bitumen*, as is generally supposed, for bitumen is insoluble in water. It is not fully saturated, as salt requires twice and a half its weight of water at a temperature of 60° for solution; but it is much stronger than any saline springs in this country. It also differs from our brine springs, by containing a greater proportion of *Chloride of Magnesium*, and less *Sulphate of Lime*, which is very abundant in our saline waters.

The strongest saline spring in this State is the Liverpool well near Syracuse.† The specific gravity of this water is only 1.114, while that of the Dead Sea is 1.211.—1000 grains of water from this well yielded 149.54 grs. of dry solid matter, while the latter yield 41 per cent. when the residuum is dried with a temperature of 180 Fahrenheit. The following table will exhibit the comparative strength of the waters of the Dead Sea, and the saline springs of the United States, rejecting the magnesia and other earthy ingredients.

Of the Dead Sea,	23 gallons of brine give	1 bushel of salt.	
At Onondaga,	45	do.	do.
Muskingum,	50	do.	do.
Illinois,	80	do.	do.
Grand River, (Ark.)	80	do.	do.
Kenawha, (Va.)	75	do.	do.
Zanesville,	95	do.	do.
Of Sea Water,	350	do.	do.
Boon's Lick,	450	do.	do.
Shawneetown, (Ill.)	280	do.	do.
Jackson, (Ohio,)	213	do.	do.

* Lyell's Geology, Vol. I. p. 209.

† Beck's Geological Report, 1838.

Bituminous matter often rises from the bottom of the lake, floats on the surface, and is thus thrown upon the shores, where it is gathered by the Arabs for medicinal and economical purposes. It is not known to contain any fish, or animals of any description, although the monks of St. Saba told Dr. Shaw, the traveller, that "they had seen fish caught in it;"* and the credulous Chateaubriand states that when he heard a noise upon the lake at midnight, the Bethlemites told him "it proceeded from legions of small fish which come and *leap about on the shore.*"† Pococke, when at Jerusalem, "heard of a missionary who had seen fish in the lake," and Hasselquist, Maundrell, Seetzen and some others have discovered a few shells on the shore. These shells, however, it is nearly certain, are brought down by the river Jordan, and in all probability the fishes also; which dying, are cast upon the shores, and thus beget the belief that the lake is inhabited. As to the tradition that no bird can fly over it and live, Mr. Stevens, our intelligent fellow-townsman, says that he "saw a flock of gulls quietly reposing on its bosom; and when roused with a stone, they flew down the lake, skimming its surface, until they had carried themselves out of sight."‡

As the ancients appear to have been better acquainted with the Dead Sea, than the moderns, I quote the following account of it from Josephus, which comprises the substance of what is related by Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, Tacitus, Pliny, Ammianus, Galen, Lucretius, Vitruvius, Aristotle, Julius Africanus, Pausanias, and the Arabian Geographer, *Schrif Ibn Idris.* "The nature of the Lake Asphaltites is also worth describing. It is, as I have said already, bitter and unfruitful. It is so light (thick?) that it bears up the heaviest things that are thrown into it; nor is it easy for any one to make things sink therein to the bottom, if he had a mind so to do. Accordingly, when Vespasian went to see it, he commanded that some who could not swim, should have their hands tied behind them, and be thrown into the deep, when it so happened that they all swam, as if a wind had forced

---

* Dr. Shaw's Travels in Palestine.

† Travels in Greece, Egypt, Palestine, &c., by F. A. De Chateaubriand, p. 263.

‡ Egypt, Arabia Petræa and the Holy Land, Vol. II. p. 271.

them upwards. Moreover the change of the color of this lake is wonderful, for it changes its appearance thrice every day, and as the rays of the sun fall differently upon it, the light is variously reflected. However it casts up black clods of bitumen in many parts of it; these swim at the top of the water, and resemble both in shape and bigness headless bulls; and when the laborers that belong to the lake come to it, and catch hold of it as it hangs together, they draw it into their ships; but when the ship is full, it is not easy to cut off the rest, for it is so tenacious as to make the ship hang upon its clods till they set it loose with the menstrual blood of women, and with urine, to which alone it yields. This bitumen is not only useful for the caulking of ships, but for the cure of men's bodies; accordingly it is mixed in a great many medicines. The length of this lake is 580 furlongs where it is extended as far as Zoar in Arabia, and its breadth is 150. The country of Sodom borders upon it. It was of old a most happy land, both for the fruits it bore, and the riches of its cities, although *it be now all burnt up.* It is related, how for the impiety of its inhabitants it was burnt by lightning; in consequence of which there are still the remainders of that divine fire, and the traces (or shadows) of the five cities are still to be seen, as well as the ashes, growing in their fruits, which have a color as if they were fit to be eaten; but if you pluck them with your hands, they dissolve into smoke and ashes." (*Wars of the Jews*, B. IV. c. viii. sec. 4.)

The only other features in the geology of this region, which seem worthy of particular note, are the frequent occurrence of sulphur and the ridge of *fossil salt*,* from 150 to 200 feet

---

* The ancients were obviously well acquainted with the existence of this salt bed, and employed it extensively for economical purposes. Galen, after describing the usual wonderful properties of the waters of this lake, which he said he had visited and tasted, ("καθαπερ και ημεις εποιησαμεν,") remarks, "Vocant autem cum salem Sodemenum a montibus circumjacentibus lacum, qui Sodoma appellantur. Multi accolæ illo sale utuntur ad varios usus, ad quos nos alio sale utimur. Sed vis salis Sodomitici talis est, ut non modo plus exsicat quam alius sal, sed magis extenuet et digerat, quid majus tostus est."

high, covered with strata of lime-stone and marl, "which runs along the western border of the sea, terminating near the extremity." This bank of salt, was likewise seen by the servant of Mr. Costigan, the Irish gentleman who circumnavigated the Dead Sea, and soon afterwards fell a victim to his imprudence. Mrs. Haight, also, one of the most intelligent, enterprising and fearless travellers of her sex, bears her testimony to the existence of this saline deposit. It is also mentioned by Maundrell, Shaw, Volney, and others. About ten miles south of the sea, are several saline springs, which overflow and form a marsh at the foot of a line of cliffs. The rocks in this whole region are bituminous, and beds of asphaltum, doubtless, exist in many places beneath the soil, and beneath the bed of the Dead Sea.* Hasselquist states that it is gathered on the shores, every autumn, in considerable quantities, by the Arabs, and carried to Damietta, where it is sold, and employed in dying wool.† Melted asphaltum or bitumen was employed in the construction of Babel, ["they had brick for stone, and slime had they for mortar,"] in building Babylon, and probably most of the very ancient cities in that region.

Springs of mineral oil, occur in many countries, as India, Calabria, Sicily, England and America, and generally in connection with coal beds, or rocks of the coal formation. Mr. Malcolm, in his travels, states that there are at least 400 wells of it in Burmah, which occupy a space of about 12 square miles. They are from 200 to 300 feet deep, and the oil, when first elevated to the surface, is of the temperature of 89°. It is exported in large quantities for lamps, and torches, for preserving wood, mat partitions, palm-leaf books, &c. from insects, and for paying boats. Each of these wells yields about 150 gallons of oil daily, which sells for about 40 cents per cwt. Petroleum is found in several places in the State of New York, and particularly in the Mississippi

---

* Voyages and Travels in the Levant, p. 284.

† We may here observe that "*slime*," or *petroleum*, is a tenacious, brown fluid, which, according to the length of its exposure to the air, or to heat, increases in thickness, and in darkness of color, until it acquires nearly the consistency of common tar; while *asphaltum* is the same substance in its highest degree of induration.

valley. In the valley of the Little Kenawha, it is found oozing up through a bed of gravel on the margin of Hew's River, for a distance of four or five miles, and is often seen floating on the surface of the water. From 50 to 100 barrels are here collected every year, and much more could be gathered, if the demand required. In the adjacent hills is a bed of coal, but Dr. Hildreth supposes that its source lies very deep in the earth. Dr. Mantell observes that "from a careful analysis of petroleum and certain turpentine oils, it is clear that their principal component parts are identical; and it appears therefore evident that petroleum has originated from the coniferous trees, whose remains have contributed so largely to the formation of coal: and *that the mineral oil is nothing more than the turpentine oil of the pines of former ages:* not only the wood, but also large accumulations of the needle-like leaves of the pines may also have contributed to this process. We thus have the satisfaction of obtaining, after the lapse of thousands of years, information as to the more intimate composition of those ancient destroyed forests of the period of the great coal formation, whose comparison with the present vegetation of our globe is the subject of so much interest and investigation. The mineral oil may be ranked with *amber*, *succinite*, and other similar bodies which occur in the strata of the earth. The occurrence of petroleum in springs does not seem to depend on combustion, as has been supposed, but is simply the result of subterranean heat. According to the information we now possess, it is not necessary that strata should be at very great depth beneath the surface to acquire a heat equal to the boiling point of water, or mineral oil. In such a position the oil must have suffered a slow distillation, and have found its way to the surface; or have so impregnated a portion of the earth, as to enable us to collect it from wells, as in various parts of Persia and India."

Such is a brief abstract of the facts I have been able to gather, in relation to the geological features of Palestine. I am aware that it is far from being complete or satisfactory; but it must be recollected that most of the travellers through this interesting country were unacquainted with geological science, and the occasional observations they have recorded, have to be received with much caution, and only admitted when supported by the testimony of others. Enough, how-

ever, has been ascertained to establish the fact, that all the formations, primitive, transition, secondary, volcanic, tertiary, diluvial and alluvial, are to be met with in this region, and that a space of a few thousand square miles, contains within its limits, an epitome of the geology of the globe. Here we behold the effects of all those natural agents, which are so constantly and efficiently at work to change the surface of this earth; rain, and floods, and frost, and volcanic fire, have here expended their fury, and striven, with the fiercer passions of man, and the wonderful events of which it has been the theatre, to render this country an astonishment and a marvel! We are now prepared to investigate the nature of the causes employed by the Almighty for the destruction of the cities of the plain.

I believe it is now generally admitted that there are sufficient indications to render it highly probable, if not to warrant the belief, that the Jordan once flowed uninterruptedly, through Wady el Arabah, to the Gulf of Akabah. During this period, I suppose, no one can doubt that the present Dead Sea did not exist, for it is impossible that an inland lake should possess the properties of the waters of this sea, while it communicates with the ocean, by a river flowing through it. It is important then to ascertain, at what period the Jordan ceased to empty into the Red Sea, and we shall determine this point, if we can find when the Dead Sea was formed. We read, Gen. xiv., that the kings of Shinar, Elassar, Elam, &c. "were joined together in the vale of Siddim, which is the Salt Sea," i. e., they were congregated in that part of the valley of the Jordan, which is now (at this time of writing) covered by the waters of the Salt Sea. Consequently it may safely be inferred, that, at that time, no such sea was in existence. In confirmation, it may be stated that this sea is not mentioned in any other place, *till after the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah*, and then we frequently find references to it. We are likewise told, that "the vale of Siddim was full of slime pits," (asphaltum,) and that "the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah fled and fell there." (Gen. 14: 10.) Prof. Robinson states that "every circumstance goes to show that a lake must have existed in this place, into which the Jordan poured its waters, before the destruction of Sodom." But what these "circumstances" are, he does not mention, and it is difficult to conceive; moreover, M.

Von Buch evidently does not coincide in this opinion, for in his letter to Prof. R. he says, "if a mass of basalt could be discovered in the southern part, or towards the southern extremity of the Dead Sea, we might suppose that a basaltic dyke had made its appearance at the celebrated catastrophe, as occurred in 1820 near the island of Banda, and also at the foot of the volcano of Ternati. The movements attending the eruption of such a dyke, would be well calculated to produce all the phenomena which have changed the face of this interesting country, without exercising a very marked influence on the figure and conformation of the surrounding mountains." The hypothesis of this distinguished geologist appears to be, that the cities were overwhelmed by the ejection of a basaltic mass, and that the plain where they stood, is now occupied by the Dead Sea, formed by the Jordan, which previously flowed south to the Red Sea. And this further appears from his remark that "fossil salt is a product of volcanic, or plutonic action, along an opening (or "fissure") of this description," viz. such as exists from the Dead Sea, to the Gulf of Akabah. The saline properties of this body of water, are now ascertained to be owing to the hill of fossil salt, described by Prof. R., Mr. Stephens and others, which is found near its south-western border; accordingly, if this was thrown up according to M. Buch's hypothesis, by volcanic action, at the time of the "catastrophe," there could have been no salt sea there previously. I feel confident, therefore, that Prof. R. will find occasion, on further reflection, to abandon the opinion that "the Jordan could never have flowed into the Red Sea, or within the times to which history reaches back," and that "the Dead Sea existed before the destruction of Sodom." It is not said in the passage quoted by Prof. R. (Gen. 14: 3.) that "the vale of Siddim was near the Salt Sea, and contained Sodom and Gomorrah," but that the kings were collected or "joined in the vale of Siddim, which is the Salt Sea." It appears from various passages in Scripture, that *four*, if not *five*, populous cities were situated in this plain, for we read in Jeremiah, (29 : 23,) "like the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboim, which the Lord overthrew in his anger," and (Jer. 49 : 18,) "as in the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the neighbor cities thereof;" and a similar expression occurs in the 40th verse of the 50th

chapter of the same prophet. Ecclesiasticus also speaks of *five* cities which were destroyed; Strabo, of *thirteen*, and Stephen of Byzantium, of *eight*. In Genesis, (19: 25,) we are expressly told, that "the Lord overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah and *all the plain;* consequently the cities on it. Now on Prof. R.'s hypothesis, as the Dead Sea already occupied the greater portion of the plain, it is difficult to conceive how sufficient space could have been left for the building of these cities, if "the southern portion of the Dead Sea only occupies their places," especially as we find that the mountains now come nearly, if not quite close to the lake, on every side.*

Again, on this hypothesis, we have no way of explaining the existence of the bank of fossil salt, for the conflagration of asphaltum pits, by lightning, could have no tendency to produce such a result; and if the salt existed previous to the catastrophe, it is difficult to account for the extraordinary fertility of the plain, as represented in Scripture: "And Lot lifted up his eyes and beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered every where, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, even as the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt, as thou comest unto Zoar:" Gen. 13: 10. It appears then highly probable, to say the least, that the Dead Sea was formed subsequent to the catastrophe, which swallowed up the cities of the plain, and that this was the result of causes which changed the face of the country to such a degree as to arrest the Jordan in its course to the Red Sea, and which, at the same time, produced those saline deposits, which have ever since rendered the neighborhood of this doomed region, the emblem of desolation and sterility. The only hypothesis, which, as it appears to me, can be reconciled with the known facts and appearances, is, that a volcanic eruption took place, an intimation, or forewarning of which, was given to Lot for the safety of himself and family, attended probably by an earthquake of great violence. The immediate theatre of the eruption was the plain of Siddim, on which the guilty cities were located, and over which were scattered petroleum ("slime") pits, and asphaltum beds, indicating the

* Prof. R. states, "we found the sea here occupying the whole breadth of the great valley." Bib. Rep. p. 27.

previous existence of subterranean fires, ready to be fanned into an out-bursting flame, by the avenging breath of the Almighty. In consequence of the internal combustion of the bituminous materials, the whole plain sunk, causing the Jordan, which previously rolled its sluggish waters into the Red Sea, with very slight declivity, to pour them into the volcanic crater, which had swallowed up the cities, and thus form a stagnant lake. Indeed, a very moderate subsidence in the neighborhood of the Dead Sea, must have arrested the Jordan, and produced, with the aid of the saline bed, the very appearances, which are actually presented.* The projection of a basaltic dyke, as suggested by M. Von Buch, would not seem to be necessary to produce the result, and it seems more philosophical, in the absence of any proof of the existence of such a dyke in the region supposed, to adopt an hypothesis, like the above, which is sufficient to account for the facts, and consonant with phenomena of a like character in different ages and countries. The deadly fumes which, for many years, would probably issue from the pestiferous lake, would easily give rise to the tradition that no bird could fly over it without falling down dead; a tradition to which Lucretius elegantly alludes in the following passage:

> "Principio quod Averna vocantur, nomen id ab re,
> Impositum est, quia sunt avibus contraria cunctis
> E regione ea quod loca cum venere volantes
> Remigii oblitæ pennarum vela remittunt
> Præcipites que cadunt molli cervice profusæ
> In terram." *Lib.* vi.

It may perhaps be objected that this hypothesis cannot be reconciled with the account in Genesis that "the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven." The word here translated *brimstone* may, according to Poole, mean *pitch* or *bitumen;* and according

---

* Prof. Robinson states that the great valley as seen from Akabah, looking northwardly, appears to have only a slight declivity; the whole conformation of the valley presenting a much longer and greater descent towards the south, seems of itself to indicate that the Dead Sea must be considerably lower than the Gulf of Akabah." Bib. Rep. p. 27.

to Dr. Adam Clarke, and other commentators, it is to be understood metaphorically, as expressing the utmost degrees of punishment executed on the most flagitious criminals. (Deut. 29 : 23, Job 18 : 15, Ps. 11 : 6, Isa. 34 : 9, Ezek. 38 : 22.) The phrase "*from heaven*," Poole understands to be equivalent to "*a seipso*," ("*pluit Dominus a Domino*,") and is employed in other passages of the Old Testament, in a similar manner, to give force and energy to the expression. Says Poole, "*sulphur peccati fœtorem, ignis libidinis ardorem significat.*" But even were we compelled to take the passage in a literal sense, yet according to the principles of interpretation, which we have adopted, it would not militate in the least, with the hypothesis above advanced.

The above considerations are offered in reply to the first inquiry of Prof. R. He next asks "whether it is allowable to suppose that, by a conflagration of the asphaltum in the pits, the soil of this plain, with the cities, might be destroyed and its level lowered; so that the waters of the lake would rush in, and thus form the southern bay?" Such a supposition can by no means be admitted, because it does not meet all the difficulties of the case. It takes for granted that the Dead Sea existed previously, which I have proved to have been very improbable, if not impossible, and a conflagration of the substratum of bitumen would not have sufficed for the destruction of the inhabitants. Indeed had Sodom and Gomorrah been built entirely of asphaltum, and the earth beneath been wholly composed of the same substance, and these been kindled by lightning, according to the opinion of Milman,* Russel, Clark, and other writers, there would have been ample time for the inhabitants to have escaped by fleeing to the mountains, as the combustion beneath the earth must have gone on very slowly. Fortunately we have a striking instance in point, to serve by way of illustration. The lake Palius, or Paliorum Lacus, in the valley of Noto, in Sicily, is often covered with petroleum, and the mud at the bottom and on the bank, which has a black color, is tenacious, and smells like pitch. The whole soil of the small plain around it, consists of black, tough, resinous, inflammable earth. A few years ago, some straw huts in the neighborhood having been set on fire, the fire was communicated to the earth, which

* History of the Jews, by H. Milman, Vol. I.

burnt with a whitish dull flame, during several months,* and was finally extinguished with the greatest difficulty.

We may form a pretty correct idea of the rapidity with which a mass of bitumen would burn beneath the surface, by the progress which combustion makes in coal beds, thus situated. In New Castle, Eng., a coal mine was burning for several years, yet it advanced but a few feet.† In the year 1765, a bituminous coal bed took fire near Pittsburgh, which has continued burning until within a few years, if it is not yet; and still it did not extend but a few rods.‡ Another coal hill on the Monongahela, Mr. Jefferson states, in his "Notes on Virginia," had then been burning ten years, and had burned away only about 20 yards. The most extensive combustion of coal, beneath the earth, which has perhaps ever occurred, took place some years ago at Benwell, about a quarter of a mile north of the river Tyne, Eng. This caught from a workman's candle, and continued burning about 20 years. After burning very slowly for several years, it at length acquired great strength, from the quantity of bitumen and sulphur which it met in its progress, and spreading in every direction, it, at last, extended more than a mile from the place of its first appearance, committing great ravages in its way, and was conspicuous only in the night by its columns of smoke and flame.§ Several years ago, a fen near the village of Ostrovizza, Dalmatia, was struck with lightning, and its bottom being turf, it burned a long time under ground, though the fire was visible only in the night; after it was extinguished, the whole fen remained black, and the upper soil became barren.‖ Now if we suppose asphaltum to be ten times more combustible than bituminous coal, we shall see that but little danger could arise to the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah from its combustion beneath the earth. We may therefore safely dismiss the opinion, that these cities were destroyed by the combustion of asphaltum beds ignited by lightning from heaven.

We read that "Lot's wife looked back from behind him,

---

* Organic Remains of a former world, by J. Parkinson, p. 41.
† Campden.
‡ Jefferson's Notes on Virginia, p. 43.
§ The Natural History of Northumberland, Vol. I. p. 132.
‖ Travels in Dalmatia, p. 37.

and she became a pillar of salt." (Gen. 19: 26.) We should have weighty authority on our side, were we to understand this passage metaphorically; as *salt* is figuratively used in Scripture as an emblem of incorruption, durability, etc. Hence a *covenant of salt*, Num. 18: 19, is a *perpetual* covenant, one that is never to be broken; and thus we may consider a "*pillar of salt*," equivalent to an *everlasting* monument against criminal curiosity and disobedience. (*A. Clarke.*) If we credit ancient writers, however, we must consider her as retaining her human shape, and proportion of parts, but changed into a mass of rock salt. Josephus says expressly that she was standing as a pillar of salt in his time, and that *he had seen it!** St. Clement and Irenius also assert that she was remaining even in their time, as a pillar of salt. The ancient fathers have not only represented her standing on the plain in her complete human form, but also as possessing a continual miraculous energy, capable of reproducing and renovating any part which might be broken off. Thus Tertullian, in his poem, "*De Sodoma*," has the following fanciful passage:

——————————et simul illic
In fragilem mutatem salem, statit ipsa sepulchrum
Ipsaque imago sibi, formam sine corpore servans,
Durat adhuc etenim nuda statione sub æthrâm,
Nec pluviis dilapsa situ, nec diruta ventis,
Quinetiam, si quis mutilaverit advena formam,
Protinus ex sese suggestu vulnera complet.
Dicitur et vivens alio sub corpore sexus,
Munificos solito dispungere *sanguine menses!*
(Tertulliani, *Opera* V. II. p. 731, Ed. *Oberthur.*)

But it is very evident that Lot's wife perished, and that Lot supposed she had been changed into salt, and that this tradition was handed down to the time of Moses. M. Von Buch well observes that "the fossil salt would not so have struck Lot as to make him imagine that his wife had been turned into salt, if its existence between the strata of the mountains had been known previous to the catastrophe." The most natural mode of accounting for her death, is to suppose that she lingered behind, out of a very natural femi-

* "*Εις ςηλην αλων μετεσαλεν ισορηκα δ' αυτην· ετι γαρκαι νον δια μενει.*" (Ant. Lib. I. c. xi. 3, 4.)

nine curiosity, to see what was going to happen, (she "looked," or turned back,) and thus separated from her husband, she was overtaken by the volcanic eruption and perished on the very spot, where the bank of salt was afterwards found to have been thrown up. Should it be objected to this hypothesis of volcanic agency in the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, that too few indications of lava are to be met with in the vicinity of the catastrophe, I may remark, that it has been proved, from the testimony of different travellers, that lava and other volcanic products are met with, in greater or less quantity in that region; particularly bitumen, sulphur, and salt. Geological works inform us, that volcanic rocks abound with bitumen, which is a combination of carbon and hydrogen, and according to the opinion of some geologists as much a mineral product as sulphur; though most believe it to be the result of vegetable fermentation, or decomposition, and distilled as it were from beds of coal beneath the surface of the earth.* The volcanic *tufa* in the vicinity of Claremont, in France, contains so much bitumen. that in warm days it oozes out, and forms streams resembling pitch; and this tufa is supposed to have been ejected some thousand years ago. Bitumen has also often been observed, oozing out of the the lava of Etna. Indeed, it is from the combustion of bitumen, that the black smoke chiefly arises during a volcanic eruption ("the smoke of the country went up as the smoke of a furnace," Gen. 19: 28). "*Muriate of soda*,

---

* It is certainly true, that the art of the chemist and the manufacturer has been able, to a good degree, to imitate petroleum, by distilling bituminous coal, and, by the ignition of wood, as happens in preparing charcoal, in iron cylinders, for the manufacture of gun-powder; also in manufacturing pyroligneous acid, during which a substance closely resembling petroleum is produced, from the distillation of which *naptha* is produced. If we admit that petroleum is the result of vegetable fermentation, and decomposition, we suppose that the region of the Dead Sea belongs to the regular coal formation, and that underneath its waters, is a coal deposit.—Throughout Asia, the petroleum springs are associated with coal beds. In the State of New-York, however, although petroleum occurs, yet our state geologists believe that our rocks do not belong to the regular coal formation.

or common salt," says Bakewell, "is often found in the craters of volcanoes." With respect to *lava*, it may be remarked, that it is not always ejected in volcanic eruptions. In Germany, for example, near the Rhine, are numerous extinct volcanoes, some having small cones and eminences; some with craters which are filled with water forming lakes, or *meres;* and many of them have ejected nothing *but loose fragments of rock*, with beds of *scoriæ* (or ashes) and *sand.** Eight volcanoes of this description, have been described by a German geologist. He likewise enumerates eight others, which have ejected fragments of *slag*, and six only, which have thrown out *lava*. It is moreover to be recollected, that in ancient times, (*how ancient* it is difficult to determine,) the action of volcanic fire was far more extensive and intense than it is at present. Between Naples and Cumea, e. g. there are no less than 60 craters, some of them larger than Vesuvius. The city of Cumea, founded 1200 years before Christ, is built in the crater of an ancient volcano. In other parts of Italy there are undoubted vestiges of ancient volcanoes. The same is true of Sicily. Many islands in the Red Sea, and the Grecian Archipelago, are volcanic. There are remains of large craters in Spain and Portugal; and those in the middle and southern parts of France, cover many thousand square miles. If we consider *trap* and *porphyry*, among the volcanic rocks, as they are generally regarded at the present day, we shall find but few countries, but what have, at some period or other, been agitated and convulsed by the agency of internal fires.

It is easy to show that the catastrophe, which overwhelmed the cities of the plain, was not a solitary occurrence of the kind, but that numerous instances are on record, of similar phenomena, even in comparatively modern times. In the year 1638 a volcano broke out in a mountain, in the island of Timore, one of the Moluccas, and during the eruption the mountain sank and entirely disappeared, and in its place is now a lake. "Many of the circular lakes† in the south of Italy," says Bakewell, "are supposed to have been formed by the sinking down of volcanoes." Governor Raffles, in his History of the Island of Java, gives an account of one of the largest volcanoes on the island, which was swal-

* Bakewell's Geology. † Ibid. p. 320.

lowed up in the earth, after a short but severe combustion, in the year 1772. He states that near midnight between the 11th and 12th of August, there was observed about the mountain an uncommonly luminous cloud, by which it appeared to be completely enveloped. The inhabitants, residing on the acclivities of the mountain, becoming alarmed, fled; but before they could all reach a place of safety, the mountain began to give way, and the greatest part of it actually *fell in*, and disappeared in the earth. *At the same time, a tremendous noise was heard, resembling the discharge of the heaviest cannon.* It was estimated that an extent of ground, of the mountain itself and its immediate environs, 15 miles long and 6 broad, was, by this commotion, swallowed up in the earth. About 40 villages, and 2,957 inhabitants were destroyed.* This catastrophe would therefore hardly suffer by comparison, with that which overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. The account of the destruction of Euphemia in Calabria, in 1638, as given by Kircher, strongly reminds us of the Scripture history of the destruction of Sodom. "Here," says he, "scenes of ruin every where appeared around me; but my attention was quickly turned from more remote to contiguous danger, by a deep rumbling sound,† which every moment grew louder. The place where we stood shook most dreadfully. After some time, the violent paroxysm ceasing, I stood up, and turning my eyes to look for Euphemia, saw only a frightful black cloud. We waited till it had passed away, *when nothing but a dismal and putrid lake was to be seen, where the city once stood.*"

Changes in the relative levels of the land, are common occurrences in volcanic countries. On the western shores of the Caspian, there is a tract called the *Field of Fire*, which emits inflammable gas, and abounds with springs of naptha and petroleum. Violent subterranean commotions have been often experienced through this region, and according to Engelhardt and Parrot, the bottom of the sea has, in modern times, varied in form, while the coast of the Isle of Idak, which was formerly very high land, has now become quite low. The island of Santa Maria, near the coast of

* Raffles' History of Java.

† Josephus states that Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed by *thunder*.

Chili, which is seven miles long and two broad, was raised in the course of a few days about ten feet. On the 19th of November, 1822, the coast of Chili was visited by an earthquake, the shock being felt throughout a space of about 1200 miles in length. On examination the following morning, it was found that the whole line of coast for a distance of 100 miles, embracing 100,000 square miles, was raised from four to seven feet above its former level. After an earthquake in India in 1819, a large portion of the Delta of the Indus, where previously the water was only a foot deep at ebb tide, was submerged to the depth of from ten to eighteen feet at low water.* The fort and village of Sindue, on the eastern arm of the Indus, were at the same time overflowed, so that the tops of the houses were only to be seen above the water. Immediately after the shock, it was found that a tract of country fifty miles long and sixteen broad, running parallel to the subsided portion, had been elevated about ten feet.† Even in our own country, these changes of level are not entirely unknown. In 1812 several severe shocks of an earthquake were experienced in the southern States. The valley of the Mississippi, from the village of New Madrid to the mouth of the Ohio, in one direction, and to the St. Francis in another, was convulsed to such a degree as to create lakes and islands. Mr. Flint,‡ Mr. Nuttall§ the naturalist, and others, tell us that a tract of many miles in extent, near the Little Prairie, became covered with water three or four feet deep; and when the water disappeared a stratum of sand was left in its place. Large lakes of twenty miles in extent were formed in an hour, and others were drained. The grave-yard at New Madrid was precipitated into the river, and the ground whereon the town is built, and the river bank for fifteen miles above, sank eight feet below their former level. At one period the ground near New Madrid swelled up, *so as to arrest the Mississippi* in its course, and to cause a temporary reflux of its waves. Mr. Lyell sums up the principal changes effected by the earthquakes of the last thirty years thus: "New rocks have risen from the waters;

* Edinburgh Phil. Journal, Vol. IV. p. 106.
† Lyell's Geology, Vol. I. p. 379.
‡ Flint's Mississippi Valley.
§ Nuttall's Travels in Arkansas.

the temperature of a thermal spring has been raised; the coast of Chili has been twice permanently elevated; a considerable tract in the Delta of the Indus has sunk down, and some of its shallow channels have become navigable; an adjoining part of the same district, upwards of sixty miles in length and sixteen in breadth, has been raised about ten feet above its former level; the town of Tomboro has been submerged, and 12,000 of the inhabitants of Sumbawa have been destroyed." These facts have been mentioned here, because they have an important bearing on the hypothesis advanced. We see that far more violent convulsions and greater elevations and depressions of land have taken place, even within the last half century, than would be necessary to arrest the Jordan, and roll back its waters into the plain of the Dead Sea, and to produce, in short, all the phenomena, which were required for the destruction of the cities of the plain. In confirmation of the fact that Syria and Palestine are volcanic countries, it should be recollected that continual mention is made in history of the ravages committed by earthquakes in Sidon, Tyre, Berytus, Laodicea, Antioch, and the island of Cyprus. Indeed an earthquake occurred but a few years since in this region which destroyed several thousand lives. A district in Asia Minor, near Smyrna, was called by the Greeks *Catacecaumene*, or the burnt, because the soil is black and cindery, and the territory arid, and without trees.*

In confirmation of the fact that Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed by a volcanic eruption, attended by an earthquake, I may add, that such a tradition has been handed down from a very remote period, as appears from the works of several ancient writers. It will suffice, perhaps, on this point to quote a single passage from the geographer Strabo. Speaking of the Dead Sea and the adjacent region, he remarks, "Esse autem ignem in solo ejus regionis multis etiam aliis signis docent. Nam et petras asperas exustas circa Mousada ostendunt: et multis in locis exesas cavernas, et terram cinerulentam, et picis guttas e petris distallantes et flumina factore eminus edito effuventia: et habitationes passim eversas; ut iis fides haberi posse videatur, quæ, ab indiginis prædicantur: in hoc loco XIII urbes olim

* Strabo, p. 900.

habitatas fuisse, quarum caput Sodoma adhuc LX stadiorum habeat superstitem ambitum : terræ autem tremoribus et ignis aquarumque calidarum, et bituminosarumàc sulphurearum eruptione extitisse lacum, saxa ignem concessisse, urbium alias absorptas, alias ab iis, qui cunque fugere potuerunt, derelictas. Eratosthenes contra sentit, regionem stagnis intus conceptis subductam, maxima ejus parte factis eruptionibus retectam fuisse ; quemadmodum et mare.* In agro etiam Gadareno est aqua quædam pessima ex lacu, qua degustata, pecora pilas, ungues et cornua, amittunt."

(*Strabonis Geographia. Casaubon.* p. 764.)

Such, in conclusion, are some of the considerations, which have occurred to me in connection with the questions proposed by Prof. Robinson. Others might be easily added,

---

* It is a remarkable fact, mentioned by Mr. Lyell, that Strabo has anticipated the modern geologists in some of their most popular and best supported theories. In the 2d book of his geography, speaking of the causes which have buried marine shells in the earth at such great elevations and distances from the sea, he remarks : " It is not because the lands covered by seas were originally at different altitudes, that the waters have risen, or subsided, or receded from some parts and inundated others. But the reason is, that the same land is sometimes raised up, and sometimes depressed, and the sea also is simultaneously raised and depressed, so that it either overflows or returns into its own place again. We must therefore ascribe the cause to the ground, neither to that ground which is under the sea, or to that which becomes flooded by it, but rather to that which lies beneath the sea, for this is more moveable, and, on account of its humidity, can be altered with greater celerity." Again : " It is proper to derive our explanation from things which are obvious and in some measure of daily occurrence, such as deluges, earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions, and sudden swellings of the land beneath the sea ; for the last raise up the sea also ; and when the same lands subside again, they occasion the sea to be let down. And it is not merely the small, but the large islands also, and not merely the islands, but the continents, which can be lifted up together with the sea ; and both large and small tracts may subside, for habitations and cities, like Bure, Bizona, and many others, have been ingulfed by earthquakes." (*S. Geog.* p. 1707.)

but my remarks have already been too much extended, and I must bring them to a close. Whenever Syria, Palestine, and Arabia, especially the region of the Dead Sea, shall be examined by a scientific geologist, I have no doubt that so many facts will be brought to bear upon the theory of Voltaic agency having been the means employed by the Almighty, in the destruction of the cities of the plain, as to place it beyond all reasonable doubt. Indeed, in the present state of our knowledge, no other theory can be reconciled with the Scripture account of the catastrophe, and the facts already ascertained. If I have aided, in any degree, in throwing light on a subject which, it seems to me, has been involved in unnecessary doubt and mystery, the object of the present essay will have been attained.

New-York, Feb. 1st, 1840.

ARTICLE V.

Baptism:—The Import of *Βαπτίζω.*

By Rev. Edward Beecher, President of Illinois College, Jacksonville, Illinois.

[*Concluded from page* 66.]

§ 14.

In Heb. 9: 10, a fair view of the scope and connexion of the passage requires *βαπτισμοι* to be used as synonymous with *καθαρισμοι.*

In this case the word does not indeed relate to the ordinance of Christian Baptism, but to Mosaic purifications. Yet it is still a religious use of the word; moreover it is applied with reference to those very usages, of which I have spoken, as adapted to cause the word *βαπτιζω* to pass from its original, to the secondary sense, to *purify.* Hence it is an example of great weight in the case, and, as might have been expected, it has been strongly contested. But with how little reason I shall endeavor to show.

The scope of chapters 8, 9 and 10, is to show that the purifications, legal and moral, provided by Christ for the conscience and the heart, had, in themselves, a real efficacy, and were, therefore, entirely superior to those of the Mosaic dispensation, which related only to the body, and could produce no purity but such as was merely external and symbolical. Let now the following things be noticed.

1. Those things only are spoken of in the whole discussion, which have a reference to action on the worshippers—that is, the whole passage relates to the effects of the Mosaic ritual entirely on *persons*, and not on *things*. The gifts, the sacrifices, the blood of sprinkling, the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, all relate to persons.

2. The *βαπτίσμοι* are spoken of as enjoined, as well as the other rites. But of persons, no immersions at all are enjoined under the Mosaic ritual. As this fact does not seem to have been noticed, as it ought, and as many assume the contrary, it is necessary to furnish the proof of this assertion.

It lies in this fact, that no washing of persons is ever enjoined by the word טָבַל, to *immerse*, even in a single instance, nor by any word that denotes immersion—but as I think without exception by the word רָחַץ, which denotes to *wash* or *purify*, without any reference to mode.

Those who read the English version might suppose that, where the direction to bathe occurs, immersion is enjoined; but in every such case the original denotes only to wash.

I do not deny that where the washing of the body, or of the flesh, or of all the flesh is enjoined, it would probably be done, if most convenient, by immersion or bathing. But I affirm that there is no washing of the person enjoined in the whole ritual, which could not be performed wherever there was water enough to wash the body all over, in any way, even though bathing or immersion was out of the question. Why should it not be so? Could Moses suppose that at all times, and in all circumstances, while in the desert, during journeys, at home and abroad, every man who became unclean, in various and numerous ways specified in the ritual, would be able to bathe or to immerse himself? Even when best supplied with the means of bathing it could not be expected, that every family, rich or poor, and however situated, would be able to have a private bath. Nor could it be expected, that every running stream or rivulet would

be deep enough to bathe in. But such was the benign regard of God to all these possible contingencies, that he did not enjoin immersion at all; but only a total washing, such as could be performed in any brook, or running stream,—or in any suitable vessel at home.

If any doubt whether this is the true view of the import of רָחַץ, let him take a Hebrew Concordance and trace it through the whole of the Old Testament, and he will have abundant proof. He will find it used to denote the washing of any thing, in any way,—of the feet, the hands, the face, the body, or the mind. Its translation in the Septuagint denotes how wide its range of meaning is;—for it is at one time *λουω*, at another *νιπτω*, and at another *πλυνω*, just as circumstances may seem to require. If ever it is applied in cases where bathing was probably performed, the idea depends not at all on the word, but on the circumstances of the case. So a Baptist writer thinks that, in the case of Pharaoh's daughter, Ex. 2: 5, the word denotes bathing. It may be true that the daughter of Pharaoh did, as a matter of fact, bathe herself,—but all our evidence of it lies in the fact, that she went down to the Nile, and not at all in the word רָחַץ, and therefore our translators have very properly rendered it wash.

I would quote passages to illustrate all these assertions, did not the proof lie so plainly on the surface of the whole usage of the word that I do not suppose any one, who has investigated the subject, will think of denying it. Let any one, who desires to see a specimen of proof, examine, in the original, Gen. 18: 4, and 43: 31, Lev. 14: 9, Ex. 29: 17, Is. 4: 4, Ps. 26: 6 and 73: 13, Is. 1: 16.

Nor is the washing of the clothes, so often spoken of, enjoined by a word denoting immersion. In all such cases, כָּבַס is used, which denotes merely to wash, a word commonly confined to the washing of clothes. But it is sometimes also applied to the washing of the mind, as in Ps. 51: 4, 9, (English version Ps. 51: 2, 7,) Jer. 4: 14, Jer. 2: 22.

It is perfectly plain therefore, that, whatever was the practice of the Jews, no immersions of the person were enjoined, and the whole Mosaic ritual, as to personal ablution, could be fulfilled to the letter, without a single immersion. I do not doubt that immersions were common, but nothing but washings of the body was enjoined—and immersions

fulfilled the law, not because they were immersions, but solely because they were washings. Of course, as רָחַץ had only the sense to wash, even in case of bathing, *βαπτίζω* would tend to the same.

3. Even where immersion was convenient, and, a priori, probable, it was not deemed essential to complete and thorough purification, or to an entire washing of the body. This I infer from the account given in Tobit 6: 2, of the washing of the young man. We are told that he went down to the river—*Το δε παιδαριον κατεβη*—for what? To immerse himself of course, the advocates of immersion will reply. Whole volumes of argument, as we all know, depend on *going down to a river*. But, how was it? did he go down to immerse himself? Hear the writer: *κατεβη περικλυσασθαι*. He went down to wash himself all around,—just as a man stands in a stream and throws the water all over his body, and washes himself by friction; a mode of washing much more thorough than a mere immersion, and corresponding much more nearly to the import of the word רָחַץ.

Let it not be supposed that I regard this as an actual fact. The story may be true or false, and yet be equally in point to illustrate the ideas of the age, in which the writer lived. If he was a Jew, as all admit, and was writing of Jews, it is enough. He would of course write in accordance with the views of his day. He may indeed, after his *περικλυσις*, have immersed himself, and very probably he did. But he did not go down for an immersion,—but for such a washing as could be performed in any stream, even though immersion was out of the question. I regard the incidental testimony of a case like this, as of far more worth than the formal testimony of the Rabbis of a later age, as to the importance attached, by the Jews, to immersion, which learned writers have so copiously adduced. For the testimony of later Jews, as to the times preceding the fall of Jerusalem, needs to be received with much doubt and suspicion. But on an incidental statement of this kind, of so early a date, no reasonable suspicion can rest.

4. The only immersions enjoined in the Mosaic law were immersions of things to which no reference can be had here, —as vessels, sacks, skins, etc. In this case no act was performed, that had any tendency to affect *the worshipper*, but only the thing immersed. But in all this passage,

Paul regards the ritual with reference to its effects on *the worshipper*. In v. 9, he says, that these rites could not make *the worshipper*, τον λατρευοντα, perfect, as to the conscience. In v. 10, he assigns the reason why. They consisted only in services which could affect the body, δικαιωμασι σαρκος—and these related to meats and drinks, and divers purifications. The και, before δικαιωμασι σαρκος, ought to be omitted, as it is by Griesbach and others;—so that those words shall not denote other ordinances, but stand in apposition to βρωμασι and πομασι, and διαφοροις βαπτισμοις, to denote the imperfection of them all, because they affect the body alone and not the mind. Hence it is perfectly plain that no reference can be had here to the immersions of *inanimate things*, but only to the purifications of *persons*. Indeed the whole scope of the passage forbids the idea of such immersions. What could any one think that the immersion of vessels of earth, or wood, had to do with purifying the conscience or the heart of a worshipper? A washing of the body, or a sprinkling of blood, or of the ashes of a heifer might seem to purify the unclean—but not surely the immersion of vessels of earth or wood, or of sacks and skins. To refer here, then, to such things, is totally unnatural, and entirely out of the train of thought.

5. Besides, the purifications of the person are διαφοροι, *diverse, various;*—but the immersions of things are not, either in act, or circumstances, or end. If vessels, or things became unclean, in the cases specified, they were all immersed, and all alike—and all for the same end. What various immersions here?

On the other hand the purifications of men were exceedingly numerous and of various kinds. Some were legal and sacrificial, relating to the atonement, and made by blood. Others were moral, relating to regeneration and purity of heart, as symbolized, sometimes by various kinds of washing, and at other times by sprinkling. To all these various kinds, reference is had in the context. Purification by blood, in ch. 9; 7, 12, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, and ch. 10: 1, 2—and in numerous other places. Purification by water, and by sprinkling of the ashes of a heifer, ch. 9: 13, and 10: 22. Why should the Apostle leave purifications so various and numerous as these, and so entirely in point, and speak of a simple regulation as to the immersion of cups and vessels

etc., things altogether foreign to the scope of the passage, as *διαφοροι βαπτισμοι*, that were unable to make perfect the worshipper? No man who had not a theory to support could bring himself to do such violence to all the laws of interpretation in a case so plain.

6. To conclude,—to give *βαπτισμοι* the sense *καθαρισμοι*, fits the word to include all the kinds of purification spoken of in the context. For, as we have seen, *καθαριζω* has an established legal and sacrificial use, in all cases of atonement by blood. And we have also seen *βαπτιζω* standing in relations of the same kind. Now in this passage the idea of purification by blood greatly predominates, as may be seen by examining the passages just referred to; and yet the idea of moral purification is also most clearly presented to the mind;—and no sense but the one assigned gives the word the scope necessary to take in both kinds. But that does, and it thus fully meets all the exigencies of the case. It is a sense fully to the purpose of Paul; it is natural, simple, easy, obvious, and gives a richness and fullness to all his ideas. The idea of immersions is out of the scope and spirit of the passage;—it is forced and unnatural: it is unfitted for the purposes of Paul, and narrows down his ideas to topics totally foreign to the subject, and has but one solitary advantage—it aids in escaping an unwelcome result.

What evidence is there against all this mass of presumptive reasoning? Does any previous probability, any law of language or of the mind, any thing in the context demand the idea of immersions? Nothing of this kind. All is the other way. The meaning claimed is highly probable, a priori, and the whole scope of the passage tends to establish it. By all laws of sound philology, then, it is here the sense.

§ 15.

In Mark 7: 4, 8, and in Luke 11: 38, *καθαριζω* is the natural and obvious sense of *βαπτιζω*, and *καθαρισμος* of *βαπτισμος*.

1. This sense fulfils perfectly all the exigencies of the passages. I know indeed that it is said by some, that in Mark there is a rise in the idea from the lesser washing of the hands, which was common before all meals, to the greater

washing implied in the immersion of the body after coming from the market. But on the other hand, there is simply a rise from the specific to the general and indefinite. They always *wash their hands* before meals, and when they return from market they also *purify themselves*, (as the nature of the case may require,) before they eat. In the latter case, Bloomfield remarks, it denotes a washing of the body, but not an immersion. The sense, καθαριζω, also more naturally suggests the reply of Christ in Luke. Now do ye Pharisees make clean, καθαριζετε, the outside of the cup, and the platter, etc.—where βαπτιζω seems to suggest καθαριζω. I admit indeed that the object of immersion might suggest the same idea. But such associations of thought are more likely, the more obvious the similarity in the meaning of the words. But, not to rely on this, I remark,

2. Nothing in the context demands the sense, immerse, and powerful reasons forbid it.

All must confess that purification is the only idea involved in the subject of thought. Now it is no more likely that a want of *immersion* offended the Pharisee, Luke 11: 38, in the case of Christ, than it is that this was the ground of offence in the case of the disciples, Mark 7. It does not appear that Christ had been to the market. Nor is it likely at all that an immersion was expected, as a matter of course, before every meal, even on coming from a crowd. The offence, in the case of the disciples, was that they had not washed their hands. An immersion was not expected of them, though they had been in crowds. Why should it be of Christ?

Rosenmuller, on this passage, well remarks, that the existence of any such custom of regular immersion, before all meals, cannot be proved. And the opinions and statements of Jewish writers, in after ages, are of very little weight. The case narrated in Tobit has, in my mind, more weight, in throwing light on actual opinions, than a host of such more modern writers. It teaches us clearly that, even in cases where it was possible, they attached no peculiar importance to the form of immersion, and thought only of a suitable washing. How much more is this likely to be true of a purification, which the Pharisee seemed to expect, as a matter of course, before every meal?

But above all, the immersion of the couches on which they

reclined at meals is out of the question. That this is the meaning of *κλινων* here, the whole context shows, and all impartial critics allow ; and these were large enough for them to recline upon, at their ease. And are we to believe that the Pharisees, and *all the Jews*, were in the habit of immersing these, just to avoid the inference that *βαπτιζω* means to *purify?* What if remarkable instances of superstition, in particular sects, can be pointed out ? Is it likely that a whole nation, *all the Jews*, ever held to a practice like this ? That they should *purify* them with various and uncommanded rites is altogether probable. But that they should immerse them is totally incredible.

Mr. Carson seems to feel this point keenly, and yet manfully maintains his ground. He says that he will maintain an immersion until its *impossibility* is proved, and suggests that the couches might be so made as to be taken to pieces for this end ! He has proved, he says, the meaning of the word,—the Holy Ghost affirms that the couches were immersed,—and to call this absurd, is to charge the Holy Ghost with uttering an absurdity ;—and he is filled with horror at the thought, and warns his opponents to beware of so fearful a crime, and he has a long dissertation on the infidel and Unitarian tendencies of allowing difficulties to shake our faith in the assertions of God. But what is all this to the point ? The question is not, Will we believe that the couches were immersed *if the Holy Ghost says so?*—but this, *Has he said so?* And what has Mr. Carson proved ? Why truly that, in other instances, *βαπτιζω* means immerse. But does this prove that it means so here ? Does it even create a probability that it does ? Not at all. The probability, as we have shown, is all the other way. Hence the demand to prove an impossibility of immersion is altogether unreasonable. And it is against his own practice in other cases. Does he not admit that *βαπτω* means to dye, or color, when it is applied to the beard and hair ? And is it impossible to dip these ? Improbable it surely is, but not half so much so as the immersion of couches.

The fact is that the whole reasoning against the sense claimed for *βαπτιζω*, in these passages, rests on false principles. It assumes a violent improbability of the meaning in question, and resorts to all manner of shifts, to prove the *possibility* of immersion, as though that were all that the

case required, whilst the truth is that no such improbability exists, but one directly the reverse, and the whole scope of the passage demands the meaning claimed, that is, to purify.

Were it necessary I would remark more in detail on the statements of Prof. Ripley, as to the dipping of hands, and the Jewish rules concerning couches, as quoted by Dr. Gill. It is sufficient to remark that these ideas are the result of the ingenuity of later ages, and the existence of any such rules or practices, in the days of Christ, is totally devoid of proof and even of probability.

§ 16.

In the case so often quoted from Sirach, 31: 25, *βαπτιζω* requires the sense, *καθαριζω*. The passage is this: *βαπτιζομενος απο νεκρου και παλιν απτομενος αὐτόν τι ωφελησε τῳ λουτρῳ αυτου*. He that is cleansed from a dead body, and again toucheth it, of what profit to him is his cleansing?

Here I remark:

1. The sense, *καθαριζω*, purify, suits the preposition *απο*,—immerse does not. It is natural to speak of purifying, or cleansing from, but not of immersing from, a dead body.

2. No immersion, in the case of touching a dead body, was enjoined, but simply a *washing of the body*, so as to leave room for various modes in various circumstances, and it is not likely that this would be spoken of as an immersion.

3. The rite of purification from a dead body was complex, and no import of the word *βαπτιζω*, but the one claimed, is adapted to include the whole. By far the most important part of the rite was the sprinkling of the water, in which had been put the ashes of the heifer. Concerning this it is said, Num. 19: 13, that whosoever shall not *purify* himself with it, after touching a dead body, "that soul shall be cut off from Israel, because the water of separation was not *sprinkled* on him." Of the washing no such thing is said, and Paul, Heb. 9: 13, refers to the sprinkling, as if it included the part of the rite on which the effect mainly, if not entirely, depends. It is the ashes of a heifer, sprinkling the unclean, that is spoken of as sanctifying to the purification of the flesh,—*ἁγιαζει προς την της σαρκος καθαροτητα*. Of course the writer could not mean to exclude so essential a part of the rite as

this, nay its very essence. Nor could he call it an immersion. It is a sprinkling. It can purify, but it cannot immerse. But the sense, *καθαριζω*, can include both the sprinkling and the washing:—for, taken together, they purify, and this is the complex result of the whole rite, and nothing else. If any object, that it is not consistent to apply *λουτρῳ* to a complex operation, like this, I ask them, how then is it consistent to apply it to the blood of Christ, which is spoken of as the blood of sprinkling? And yet we are spoken of as washed from our sins in his own blood, where *λουω* is used. The truth is that the sense of *λουω* is general too, and denotes merely a washing or cleansing, without respect to mode. Besides, an actual washing is a part of the complex rite.

The effort of Prof. Ripley to establish the sense, bathing, from the word *λουτρον*, is vain. No fact is more notorious than that *λουω*, of itself, does not mean to bathe. In this respect it is as unlimited to any mode as רָחַץ; so much so that the vessels, in the vestibules of ancient churches, for washing the hands, were called *λουτηρες*, as well as *νιπτηρες*. One of the Fathers, as quoted by Suicer, says *λουτηρες ὑδατος πεπληρωμενοι*, stand before the gate of the church, that you may wash your hands (*νιψης*), so without the church, sit the poor, that by alms you may wash (*πλυνῃς*) the hands of your soul. I do not quote this passage for the sake of its theology, but to show that *λουω* and its derivatives mean simply to wash or to cleanse, and not to bathe, any more than the Latin lavo. Circumstances may show that bathing is meant, but the word itself does not.

Mr. Carson says that all reasoning from this passage proceeds on the assumption that the Jews had made no additions to the rite. Not so. It proceeds upon the assumption that they had not omitted its very essence, the sprinkling with the ashes of a heifer, and that they would not call this an immersion, but a purification, as in fact it was; and that as no immersion was enjoined, but simply washing, so the sense, immersion, is not to be assumed without necessity and without proof, and against the whole probability of the case.

That the Jews did take the view of this rite that I claim, is plain from the account given of it by Philo. He directs the whole attention to sprinkling and nothing else; vol. 2,

p. 251.* He says Moses does this philosophically, for most others are sprinkled with unmixed water, some with sea or river water, others with water drawn from the fountains. But Moses employed ashes for this purpose. Then, as to the manner, they put them into a vessel, pour on water,—then moisten branches of hyssop with the mixture, (*εκ του κραματος βαπτοντας υσσοπου κλαδους,*) then sprinkle it upon those who are to be purified, *τοις καθαιρομενοις.* And this account was written after the passage in question. Here we note, in passing, a use of *βαπτω* with *εκ*, at war with the idea to dip, and consistent only with the idea to moisten or wet.

Now for what reason are we to set aside probabilities like these? Merely to avoid so simple, natural and probable a conclusion, as that *βαπτιζω* sometimes means simply to purify, as in this case it most clearly does.

§ 17.

The case of Judith also sustains the same view. In Judith 12: 7, we are told that she remained in the camp of Holofernes three days, and, by night, that is, *on each night*, she went out to the valley of Bethulia and purified or washed herself, in the camp at the fountain of water. *Παρεμεινεν εν τη παρεμβολη ἡμερας τρεις, και εξεπορευετο κατα νυκτα εις την φαραγγα Βετυλουα και εβαπτιζετο εν τη παρεμβολη επι της πηγης του ὑδατος.*

Here we notice that the purification in question was performed in the camp, and at or near the fountain—and for three nights in succession. In the case of Tobit, a man at a river, and away from all observation, we know that immersion was more probable. But here a female, in a camp, and at or near a fountain, it is insisted, did immerse herself, three nights in succession. We are told of her courage and faith, and of possible bathing places near the spring, and all for what? To avoid so obvious a conclusion as that the writer merely means to say that she purified, or washed herself, without reference to the mode. In the case of Susannah, we

---

* The edition in the Andover Library. Its edition and date I did not note.

are told that she desired to wash herself, λουσασθαι, in the garden, because it was warm. Here she could shut the doors and be alone, v. 17. Yet the writer says merely *wash*. But in the case of Judith, even in a camp, he must needs insist, it seems, on the mode, and that mode must be immersion. And what reason is there for all this? Is not the sense καθαριζω, a priori, probable? Yes. Does it not fulfil all the exigencies of the case? Yes. Was it of any importance to specify the mode? No. Do the circumstances of the case call for immersion? No; they seem, at first sight entirely to forbid it; and nothing but skill in suggesting possibilities can at all remove the impression. In fact the circumstances of the case have led the vast majority of minds in all ages to feel that immersion is not the meaning here,—and that to purify or to wash is. Hence it is that Mr. Carson, in his arduous attempt to prove that βαπτιζω never means to wash, irrespective of mode, is obliged to admit that he has "all the lexicographers and commentators" against him. p. 79.

§ 18.

No contrary probability, or usage, can be established from the writers of the New Testament age, or of the preceding age, who used the Alexandrine Greek. It will be noticed that the argument thus far is specific, and relates to a religious usage, produced at a particular time, and by particular circumstances definitely and clearly marked. Now to refute this argument, it is of no use to go to writers who lived and wrote entirely out of this range of circumstances and ideas. It could only prove that, in other circumstances, another usage of the word did exist, and this no one need deny.

But it is very noticeable that, in the very writers where alone proof of an opposite religious usage, or even of a probability of it, can, reasonably be looked for, there is none to be found. It is in these very writings that the whole current of probability, and of usage, sets strongly the other way.

I do not deny that these writers do also use the word βαπτιζω, in other circumstances, and in a secular sense, to denote immersion, sinking, overwhelming or oppression. But this only proves that the two usages did coexist; just as Mr.

Carson proves that the two usages of *βαπτω* did coexist in Hippocrates, and that the existence of the one did not disprove the existence of the other. So, at least four meanings of the word spring coexist, and yet no one infers from one that the others do not exist.

That the religious usage of these writers all sets one way, one obvious and admitted fact may show. Mr. Carson admits that all the lexicographers and commentators do assign to the word *βαπτιζω* the unlimited sense to wash, or cleanse. Now on what writers do they rely? Beyond all dispute on the writers of Alexandrine Greek,—the very writers who have furnished all the facts on which this argument is based. And these writers, be it noticed, furnish no presumption or usage the other way. Even in those minuter shades of meaning, which are furnished by allusion, comparison or association of ideas, all things tend the same way. So, in the account of the baptism of Paul, the sacrificial reference of Baptism is plainly indicated, Acts 22: 16: Arise and be baptised, and wash away thy sins, *Αναστας βαπτισαι και απολουσαι τας ἁμαρτιας σου*, calling upon the name of the Lord. Here we have faith in Christ, the washing away or pardon of sins, and a purification intended to symbolize it. *Βαπτισαι*, purify thyself, or be purified bodily,—*απολουσαι τας ἁμαρτιας*, wash away thy sins, as to the mind, by calling on the name of the Lord. Here the antithesis and correspondence are beautiful and complete, and one seems naturally to suggest the other. So the case in Peter 3: 21, where he speaks of baptism as saving us, is far more natural and beautiful, if we adopt this sense, for he seems to think that, if he left the word *βαπτισμα* unguarded, he might be taken to mean the external purification of the body. But as this does not save us, and as nothing but the purification of the mind does, he guards himself and says, I do not mean the putting away of the filth of the flesh, by the purification of which I speak, but the answer of a good conscience towards God. Hence, too, the legal or sacrificial sense lies upon the very face of the passage,—for it is the purification of the conscience by atoning blood, to which he refers, and not to an external washing at all; and I need not say to any one who can feel the nice correspondencies of words, how much more beautiful and clear the whole passage becomes by assigning to *βαπτισμα* the sense of a spiritual purification, by the blood of Christ, which

Peter affirms that it has. On the subject, however, of the external washing in this case, I shall speak more at large under another head.

So too the account given by Josephus of the baptism of John, Antiq. B. xviii. c. 5, § 2, presents the same train of thought to the mind. Instead of the awkward translation of Whiston I prefer to give a free statement of the obvious sense, and to quote the original where critical exactness is needed.

John, he says, informed the Jews that before they could be baptized they must commence and profess the practice of piety towards God, and justice towards each other—and that their baptism would be acceptable to God, if they did not rely upon it as a means of putting away a part only of their sins, but used it merely as a means of purifying the body, to indicate that the soul had been previously, thoroughly purified by righteousness.

To denote baptism he uses the word *βαπτίσει*, and to denote its import he states that they are to use it, *εφ' ἁγνείᾳ του σωματος, ἁτε δε και της ψυχης δικαιοσυνη προεκκεκαθαρμενης.* Now here, I remark that there was nothing to cause Josephus or any other Jew to think of the mode, or to attach any importance to it. No idea of a fancied reference, in the rite, to the death of Christ, could bias his mind towards the sense immerse. To him, it is plain, that it meant nothing but purifying the body, to indicate that the mind had been previously thoroughly purified by righteousness; and he speaks just as he would, if these ideas had been suggested by the name of the rite; in other words, just as he would if *καθαρσις* had stood in the place of *βαπτίσει*.

Now although I would not rely on such places for proof, against a strong contrary probability, yet when I find them so perfectly coincident with all other facts, when all shades of probability so perfectly harmonize and blend in a common result, I cannot hesitate, for I see no good reason for doubt. It is not a solitary fact on which the argument rests. To overthrow it, the whole current of probability must be reversed, and so striking a coincidence and harmony of meaning, in so many independent passages, be supposed to exist without a cause. Particular errors may no doubt be detected in the argument, and individual passages, viewed out of their relations, may be made to admit another possible

sense. But that a fair and comprehensive view of all the facts of the case can be made to lead to a result opposite to the one here maintained, I shall not think possible, until I see it done; and there are no new and undiscovered means for doing it. The facts all lie within a given and definite compass, and they can easily be placed before the minds of all. If any that bear on the case have been omitted, it can easily be shown. If not, then it must be shown that the principles, on which this argument rests, are unsound, or that they have not been accurately applied, and I am not aware that either of these things can be done.

The argument, from the usage of the writers of Alexandrine Greek is now at an end. Other considerations, as it regards this part of the subject, still remain; but the statement of them will be deferred till the leading objections to this view shall claim our attention.

I shall now proceed to show that evidence of the truth of this view is also to be found in the writings of the Fathers.

I appeal to them, not because I think that their opinions, on questions of interpretation, or sacred philology, are of much weight, for it is well known to all, either that their attainments in biblical literature were small, or that their principles of philology were to a great extent fluctuating or unsound. Nor do I appeal to them, because I deem their theological opinions of peculiar weight. They deserve, indeed, a respectful attention, and are of great use in investigating the history of opinions. Moreover they often furnish rich and valuable materials for thought. But nothing can be more desperate than the attempt to make a regular and harmonious system of truth from their works. The sentence of Milton on them is well known; and though, if left unbalanced by other considerations, it would produce undue neglect, yet it is essentially based on truth. But I refer to them, simply as furnishing facts in the history of language, and it will be my object to show that these facts are such as would naturally flow from the truth of the view which I have given.

My position then is this: if we admit that in the days of Christ, *καθαριζω* was the import of *βαπτιζω*, taking all the texts in the New Testament in which the word occurs, and the ideas connected with the rite, and looking at the laws of

the mind and the natural course of thought, we shall find that no view can so well explain the usus loquendi of the Fathers and the opinions entertained by them, and by their opponents, of the import and effects of the rite.

§ 19.

This view shows how *αναγενναω*, to regenerate, and other words of like import, could easily become, with the Fathers, synonymes of *βαπτιζω*. That these words did so become, is a notorious fact, as will presently be proved, but a satisfactory reason is not commonly assigned. The true reason appears to be this: *καθαριζω*, and of course *βαπτιζω*, in its spiritual sense, is in fact a synonyme of *αναγενναω*;—for what is it to purify the spirit, but to regenerate? In fact this very form of speech is used to denote this thing, Acts 15: 9. He made no difference between them and us, "having purified their hearts by faith," *τη πιστει καθαρισας τας καρδιας αυτων*. So too the pure in heart, *καθαροι τη καρδια*, shall see God, Matt. 5: 8. Who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and *purify*, *καθαρισῃ*, unto himself a peculiar people, Tit. 2: 14. So Eph. 5: 26.

Now in a case where analogical senses exist, one external and material and the other spiritual, it is natural that they should run into each other, and terms applied to one be applied to the other. Thus if *βαπτιζω* means to purify, then there is natural purification and spiritual purification, or regeneration, and there would be a tendency to use *αναγενναω* to denote the latter idea and also to transfer it to the external rite. And, at first, it would be so done as merely to be the name of the rite, and not to denote its actual efficacy. So in Justin Martyr, *βαπτιζω* is rarely, if ever, used at all to describe the rite, but *αναγενναω*. *Επειτα αγονται ὑφ' ἡμων ενθα ὑδωρ εστι και τροπον αναγεννεσεως ὁν και ἡμεις αναγεννηθημεν αναγεννωνται*:—Then they are brought by us where there is water, and in the manner of regeneration, in which we were regenerated, they are regenerated; that is, in the manner of baptism, wherein we were baptized, they are baptized. And this use was general and familiar, as may be fully seen in the quotations collected by Wall in his history of infant baptism.

Now the idea to immerse has no such spiritual and ana-

logical sense to denote regeneration, and of course cannot explain such a transfer.

If it is said that this use grew out of the idea of baptismal regeneration, which early prevailed, I ask again, what led to its early prevalence? To this inquiry no other view can give so satisfactory a reply as the one which I maintain.

§ 20.

This view explains not only the early prevalence of the idea of baptismal regeneration, but also of the other extreme, the entire denial of water baptism.

The facts are these. There are two kinds of purification, that of the Spirit and that of water;--one real and effectual, the other only a symbol, an external rite, and yet both are called by the same name, purification, or baptism.

Now in the New Testament there is a class of texts, in which the true and spiritual purification alone is spoken of, and a saving energy is ascribed to it; as Eph. 4: 5, Gal. 3: 27, 1 Cor. 12: 13, Rom. 6: 3, 4, Col. 2: 12, Eph. 5: 26, 1 Pet 3: 21, Titus 3: 5, John 3: 5. That the external form cannot be here spoken of, I propose to show in another place. I refer to these passages here to illustrate fully the idea.

But soon, what was at first said only of the essential spiritual purification, was attached to the form, according to the uniform tendency of the human mind to sink from the spirit to the form, and thus made baptismal regeneration, and all its train of errors. And as one extreme begets another, those who opposed this view as too carnal, relying on those passages where baptism denotes clearly no more than a spiritual purification, would deny that the form was to be used at all. In practice, words are things. Systems grow out of words. And a word of a double analogical sense, like purify, would naturally give rise to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, on the one side, and to an entire denial of water baptism on the other; and that such were the results all know. On the other hand, the word in the sense to immerse, tends to no such result, for the spiritual sense, in this usage, has no relation at all to regeneration or purity in any form, and denotes, as before stated, only to overwhelm, to oppress. And it deserves notice, that the

same passages, which, by this process of sinking the spiritual in the natural, gave rise to the gross errors of baptismal regeneration, are still the passages which, in consequence of the general concession of the church that they relate to the external form, fill the hands of the Campbellites, and other errorists of the like kind, with their most powerful weapons.

Had the word been *καθαριζω*, so that its analogical uses could have been noticed, and its real import felt, the root of the error would have been seen. But by using the word baptize, as a technic, the eye has been entirely blinded to the laws which influenced the mind in its original use. And, until that class of passages, from which the doctrine of baptismal regeneration sprung, is restored to their original, true and spiritual sense, the occasions of this pernicious error can never be thoroughly eradicated from the Christian church.

Hence I do not ascribe the origin of the usage of *αναγενναω*, as a synonyme of *βαπτιζω*, to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration as some do,—but rather believe that the natural and early use of this word to denote the rite, and a false application of certain texts to it, gave rise to the doctrine itself, and that, when this doctrine was established, the whole range of language pertaining to regeneration passed over to the rite, as *φως, φωτισμος, παλιγγενεσια, Θεογεννεσια, αναπλασις*;—that is, light, illumination, regeneration, the divine generation, a new creation. Hence also *φωτιζω*, to baptize.

§ 21.

Besides this general reasoning from well known facts, there is also philological proof that the word was often used by the Fathers in the sense *καθαριζω*. That the other sense also occurs I need not deny; for they were originally formed rather in the school of classic, than of Alexandrine Greek. In their case two currents met, and we are not to look so much for universally consistent use, as for evidence that the Alexandrine current did mingle in the stream. Hence I remark,

1. The earlier Christian writers do not so often use the word *βαπτιζω*, as some synonyme derived from the sense to purify, as *αναγενναω*, as before stated. Nor do they fix the mind on the idea immerse, but on purification, and use such paraphrases as denote it. Thus, after the passage of Justin

Martyr already quoted, he says, in describing the mode of regeneration or baptism, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, *λουτρον ποιουνται*, they wash or purify them.

2. They often use *βαπτισμος* in the legal and sacrificial sense, so as to exclude any idea but *καθαρισμος*. So Chrysostom, Hom. 33, says, "He calls his cross and death, a cup and baptism,—a cup, because he readily drank it; baptism,(*βαπτισμον*,) because by it he purified, *εκαθηρεν*, the world;" that is, he calls it *purification*, because by it he *purified* the world, in which case the sense is sacrificial, he made atonement for the world,—and the reason assigned depends, for all its force, on giving to *βαπτισμος* the sacrificial sense *καθαρισμος*. I do not quote this, nor the following passages, because I believe that he assigns the true reason, but simply to illustrate his use of language.

So Theophylact, on Matt. 20: 22, 23, says, "He calls his death *βαπτισμον ως καθαρτικον οντα παντων ημων*; as making a purification, or expiation for all of us," where the whole force, as before, rests on giving to *βαπτισμον* the sacrificial sense *καθαρισμον*. As if he had said, he calls his death a *purification*, because it was *designed to purify* all of us. So, on Mark 10: 38, 39, he says, "He calls his cross *βαπτισμον*, as about to make a purification for sins," *καθαρισμον των αμαρτιων*. Here the sacrificial sense is still more evident, and undeniable, and requires *βαπτισμον* to mean *καθαρισμον*, as before. Many other passages of a like kind could be adduced, but it is needless.

3. They sometimes, in describing the rite, use *καθαιρω* or *καθαριζω* alone. Thus Gregory-Nazianz. says, *οψει καθαιρομενον Ιησουν εν τω Ιορδανη την εμην καθαρσιν μαλλον δε εγνιζοντα τη καθαρσει τα ὑδατα—ου γαρ δη αυτος εδειτο καθαρσεως ὁ αιρων την αμαρτιαν του κοσμου*; that is, thou shalt see Jesus purified, i. e. baptized, in the Jordan, with my purification, i. e. baptism, or rather, sanctifying the waters, by his purification: for he did not need purification who taketh away the sins of the world Here *βαπτιζω* is not used at all in describing the rite, and in its place is used *καθαιρω* and its derivatives, both in a moral and sacrificial sense.

Again, "He who can take away the sins of others," *ὁν καθαρσιων ενεκα επι τα ναματα ερχεται, αλλ ὡστε δυναμιν αυτοις ενθειναι καθαρτικην*, does not come to the water for the sake of

being purified himself, but to impart to it a purifying power.

Here, as before, I do not vouch for the truth of the ideas. They are pregnant with superstition. From the notion that Christ, at his baptism, gave to the water a purifying power, came the idea of holy water, and of a mysterious influence or presence in the water of baptism, which is a constituent part of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Still the passages are of no less importance in showing the use of words; and for this alone I quote them.

It would be of no avail, here, to say that the Fathers did in fact immerse; this could not decide that purify was not the sense,—and even if it could be shown that some of them use the word *βαπτιζω* to denote the act of immersion in baptism, it would avail nothing. It would only prove inconsistent usage. But in the confluence of classical and Alexandrine Greek, after the days of Christ, and in writers so various and so multifarious, we are not to look for consistent usage. It is enough that we find the usage claimed. We should rather expect a transition from the original ideas of the New Testament writers, through a period of inconsistent usage, till, as the form usurped the place of the spirit, and a superstitious efficacy was attached to immersion, the original sense would disappear, and the name of the form alone remain, as is the case in the Greek Church at the present day.

I do not expect to find in the Fathers a correct philosophical account of the origin or progress of their own errors. They assign different, and often inconsistent reasons for the usages of language already adverted to. It is enough for me that I have the facts before me, and the laws of the mind to explain them. They are just such as I should expect, on the supposition that the original religious sense of *βαπτιζω* was *καθαριζω*.

ARTICLE VI.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF DEISM.

By Rev. Enoch Pond, D. D., Prof. Theol., Theol. Sem., Bangor, Me.

BY Deism is meant that form of religion, which admits the existence of a Supreme Being, but denies that he has made a supernatural revelation of his truth and will to mankind, in the Scriptures. In other words, it is that form of religion which, while it admits the Divine existence, denies the truth and inspiration of the Bible.

Of Deism, as of most other forms of error, there are different degrees. There are those, who professedly and openly discard revelation, avowing that its claims to have come from God are without foundation. There are others, who, while they do not professedly discard the Bible, are yet its real opposers and enemies. They secretly reproach it, endeavor to undermine it, and labor to turn its doctrines into ridicule and contempt. It will be seen, that this second class of Deists has been much more numerous, in modern times, than the first.

There is still a third class of men, who fall fairly within the ranks of Infidelity, who, while they admit that the Bible *contains* a revelation from God, still leave it to each individual to determine what, and how much, this revelation is. It is not the *whole* Bible, but is contained *in* the Bible; and every reader of the Bible is to judge for himself, what portions of it are to be regarded as of Divine origin, and what not. A principle such as this amounts obviously to a species of infidelity; since it is a manifest rejection of the *canonical Scriptures* as an infallible rule of faith and life. One person sets aside this passage as constituting no part of the revelation, and another that; and we need a new Bible, to inform us what parts of the Old are to be received, and what rejected.

In presenting a brief account of discussions relative to the Divine authority of the Scriptures, I shall have no occasion

to go farther back than to the first age of Christianity. The Jews were a people by themselves. They held their Scriptures as a sacred deposit, which they were to *keep*, rather than *circulate;* and the surrounding nations were either so entirely ignorant of these Scriptures, or they held them in so much contempt, as to enter into no controversy respecting them. The ancient idolaters would all have rejected the Jewish Scriptures; or, at best, would have placed them on a level with the responses of their own oracles, and the dreamings of their own diviners, but previous to the Christian era, I am not aware that there was any considerable controversy respecting them.

Near the close of the first century, Josephus published his Antiquities at Rome. They were written in the Greek language, and for the express purpose of vindicating the great antiquity of the Hebrew nation, and of making the Greeks and Romans acquainted with their history. But some of the learned Greeks, who read the books of Josephus, were very incredulous as to his statements; and entered into formal controversy with him on the subject. Their writings are now lost; but a triumphant refutation of them, from the pen of Josephus, is extant. His two books against Apion, in which he refutes the calumnies, not only of Apion, but of several others, and demonstrates from the early records of the Chaldeans, Egyptians, and Phenicians, the high antiquity of the Hebrews, will remain as a monument of the learning of Josephus, and of his zeal for the honor of his people.

The earliest enemies of the Christian Scriptures were the Jews and heathens. With the Jewish unbelievers, several of the early fathers engaged in controversy. The dialogue of Justin with Trypho, the Jew, is still extant, in which the former endeavors to prove to the latter, from the writings of the Jewish prophets, that the Messiah *has come*, and that Jesus of Nazareth *is the Christ*.

The first efforts of the Pagans against the Christians were directed, not so much to discredit their writings, as to defame their characters, and destroy their lives. Because these Christians had no images among them, and refused to worship the idols of the heathen, they were charged with atheism. And because they were constrained from a regard to their own safety, to hold their meetings in private, and often in the night season, they were accused of practising int hem

the most foul and horrible crimes. To refute these calumnies, and stay the effusion of innocent blood, was the object of most of the Apologies for the Christian faith which were early written. Several of these Apologies, particularly those of Justin, Tertullian, and Minucius Felix, we have in our hands, and they should be diligently pondered by every Christian student. Next to the writings of the Apostles, they furnish the best exposition, and the most authentic monument, of primitive Christianity.

The first of the heathen philosophers who entered into formal controversy with the ancient Christians, was Celsus, an Epicurean, who lived about the middle of the second century. His work against Christianity, which he entitled "The True Word," is irrecoverably lost, except so much of it as may be extracted from the reply of Origen, which was published almost a hundred years after Celsus was dead. Enough of it, however, remains, to give us a pretty full idea of the character of the work. Amidst a multitude of frivolous objections, and much ridicule and reproach, he bears the most unequivocal testimony to the authenticity of our sacred books, and to some of the more material facts of the Scripture history. He speaks of the Pentateuch as an acknowledged writing of Moses. He was familiar with the books of the Old Testament, and represents them as having a Divine authority among Jews and Christians. He not only admits, but *insists*, that the Gospels were written by the early followers of Christ. "From your own writings ye have these things. We make use of no other witness. Ye fall in your own snare." He admits that our Saviour performed many miracles, though, like most of the idolaters of that age, he ascribes them to magic. "Supposing these things to be wrought by him, they are of the same nature with the works of *enchanters*, and of them who have learned of the Egyptians." On the whole, I regard the work of Celsus as one of great interest to the Christian student. It furnishes a most important link in that strong chain of evidence, which goes to establish the authenticity and Divine authority of our sacred books.

Cotemporary with Celsus was the Greek critic and satirist, Lucian. He satisfied himself with ridiculing the Christians, without any very serious attempts at opposition.

Near the middle of the next century flourished Porphyry,

a learned eclectic philosopher and voluminous author. He published a work in opposition to the Christians, in fifteen books, which was replied to, at great length, by Methodius, Eusebius the historian, and Apollinaris of Laodicea. Through the mistaken zeal of some of the Christian Emperors, particularly of Theodosius, the work of Porphyry was suppressed and extirpated, so that no copies of it were left. We can judge of it, therefore, only from some scattered fragments, which may be collected from Eusebius, Jerome, and other ancient writers. It seems that Porphyry had strong objections to the prophecies of Daniel. These productions were so remarkable, and had been so remarkably fulfilled, that Porphyry insisted, in opposition to the strongest historical proofs, that the book of Daniel must have been written subsequent to the reign of Alexander, and after the principal events purporting to be foretold in it, had been accomplished.

At the period of which we now speak (the middle and latter part of the third century), when Christianity had made great progress, and was exciting attention and interest every where, numerous heathen philosophers and rhetoricians took up their pens in earnest to refute it; but in most instances, not only their works, but their *names* have perished! I shall notice but two or three of them—the only ones, however, of whose writings we have any knowledge.

Hierocles flourished near the beginning of the fourth century, and was a principal adviser and promoter of the Diocletian persecution. Not content with destroying the innocent Christians, he took up his pen to oppose and revile them. He endeavored to show, that the sacred Scriptures destroy themselves, by means of their numerous self-contradictions. He reviled the Apostles as ignorant and illiterate propagators of falsehood, some of whom got their livelihood by fishing. He does not deny our Saviour's miracles, but supposes, with Celsus, that they were performed by magic; alleging that Apollonius Tyanæus was as great a magician and miracle-worker as he. In proof of this, Hierocles abridged and republished a life of Apollonius, which had been previously written by Philostratus, an Athenian.

As much was said of this Apollonius, at the period of which we here speak, and as he has been referred to by infidels in modern times as the rival and compeer of our Sav-

iour, it may not be improper to annex a brief account of him. He was born at Tyana, a city of Cappadocia, near the commencement of the Christian era. He early joined himself to the Pythagoreans, and faithfully practised all the requisite austerities, in order to an initiation into that community. He endeavored to imitate Pythagoras as closely as possible, and like him travelled extensively in foreign lands. At length, he established himself at Ephesus, and there gathered a school after the manner of the ancient Pythagorean college. He practised magical arts, and professed to have much intercourse with the gods; but the wonders recorded of him, and the stories which he told, are so absolutely incredible and ridiculous, as to render him entirely unworthy of confidence. Thus he affirms, that the Bramins of India, among whom he travelled, keep tubs full of rain, wind, and thunder, constantly by them, which they bestow upon their friends, or inflict upon their enemies, according to their pleasure—that the earth swells and rolls, like the waves of the sea, only with the touch of a Bramin's wand; —that at the feasts of the Bramins, there is no need of servants, since the chairs, stools, pots, cups, dishes and plates understand every one its own office, and move spontaneously, hither and thither, as the case requires. He asserts that, in the course of his travels, he found, in one country, the women half black and half white; in another, a nation of pigmies, living underground; in another, apes as large as men, and a kind of beasts which had faces like men, and bodies like lions. In another country which he visited, he found wool growing out of the ground like grass, and dragons as plenty as sheep in other places. Apollonius pretended to be familiar, not only with all the languages of men, but also with those of beasts and birds; which gift he assures us he acquired instantly, in consequence of eating a dragon's heart. Such are some of the narrations of Apollonius; all gravely related by his veracious biographer; and this is the man whom unbelievers, in ancient and in modern times, have undertaken to hold up, as the compeer of our blessed Saviour.

I shall notice but another of the ancient enemies of Christianity, and this is the Emperor Julian. This man was born, A. D. 331, and educated among the Christians. He was a nephew of Constantine the great, and upon the death of the sons of Constantine, became sole Emperor of Rome. In the time

of his prosperity, Julian renounced the Christian faith, became bigotedly attached to the Pagan theology, and near the close of life published a book, with the design of overthrowing Christianity. Like most who had preceded him on the same side of the question, Julian admits the authenticity of the sacred books of the Christians, and the miracles of our Saviour, and urges various objections drawn from the books themselves. These objections were replied to, at great length, by Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem.

From the death of Julian, which took place, A. D. 363, there was no longer any organized opposition to the Christian faith in the Roman empire; and no writer of any note appeared in opposition to Christianity for the next thousand years. The Christian world was agitated with various internal controversies; but the great controversy respecting the foundations of the Christian faith was permitted to slumber.

In the thirteenth century, there were those in Italy, who were regarded as enemies of the Christian religion; but whether they were Deists, or Atheists, or what form their infidelity assumed, it is not easy to determine.

In the sixteenth century, complaints were again made of Deists in different parts of Europe, particularly in Italy and Germany. Among these, we find the name of no less a personage than Leo X. He is reported to have said, that he "considered the Christian religion a fable, though a very gainful one." Another of the infidels of this age was that impersonation of vanity, and of literary and medical quackery, Paracelsus.

The first in the ranks of English Deists, who have appeared in modern times, was Lord Edward Herbert, Baron of Cherbury. He published his book, *de Veritate*, in the year 1624, and several works subsequent to this, in all of which he asserts the sufficiency, universality, and absolute perfection of the religion of nature. This universal religion he reduces to the five following articles: "1. There is one Supreme God. 2. He is chiefly to be worshipped. 3. Piety and virtue constitute the principal part of his worship. 4. If we repent of our sins, God will pardon them. 5. There is a future state of rewards and punishments."

Lord Herbert is represented as being himself an amiable, moral man; although the morality which he inculcated was of a very loose character. In his book *de Veritate*, he in-

sists that those are not to be condemned, who are urged to sin by any thing growing out of their particular bodily constitution, more than a dropsical person is to be condemned for immoderate thirst.

With all his philosophy, Lord Herbert was not wholly free from the charge of superstition. When he had prepared his book *de Veritate*, he was still uncertain whether to publish it; and he prayed to God, that if it was his will the book should be published, he would deign to give him a sign from heaven. "Immediately," he says, "I received a sign. A loud though gentle noise came forth from the heavens, (for it was like nothing on earth,) which so cheered and comforted me, that I could but regard my petition as granted. Whereupon I resolved to print my book."—Thus this impugner of all revelation professed to have received a direct revelation, and to have been governed by it in an important question of duty.

Charles Blount was a follower of Lord Herbert, and published a translation of one of his books. He also published a translation of Philostratus' life of Apollonius Tyanæus, with Notes, designing to hold him up as a rival magician and worker of miracles, in opposition to our Lord Jesus Christ. Blount became desperately in love with his own sister-in-law, and wished to marry her; and because she refused him, he put an end to his life, about the year 1690.

Of Hobbes, some notice was taken in a previous article. I regard him as rather an Atheist, than a Deist.—The same may be said of Toland, who lived at about the same time with Hobbes. He published a work, entitled *Pantheisticon*, in which he avows himself an admirer of the philosophy of Spinoza, which really acknowledges no God but the universe. He published another work, called *Amyntor*, in which he endeavors to show that the apocryphal books of the New Testament have as high claims to be considered of Divine authority, as any of those belonging to the canon.

Among the infidels of Great Britain, who have appeared successively during the last hundred and fifty years, are the Earl of Shaftesbury, the Earl of Rochester, Collins, Woolston, Tindall, Morgan, Neville, Harrington, Chubb, Dodwell, Hume, Lord Bolingbroke, and more recently, Gibbon and Thomas Paine.

Lord Shaftesbury published his characteristics in the year

1711, in which, notwithstanding his efforts at concealment, his opposition to Christianity is sufficiently manifest.

The Earl of Rochester, after having done more than almost any other man to corrupt the age in which he lived, and having ruined his own health by a life of debauchery, became at length a hopeful penitent and convert, and ended his days a very decided believer. Among the last acts of his life was a request and an injunction, that all his profane and lewd writings should be burned.

Anthony Collins published a discourse on Free Thinking, in 1707; and afterwards a book entitled, "The Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion." In this latter work, he allows Christianity no other foundation than the *allegorical*, or (as he understood it) the *false* sense of the Jewish prophecies.

Woolston published several discourses on the miracles of our Saviour, in which, under pretence of defending the allegorical sense of Scripture, he endeavors utterly to destroy the truth of the facts recorded in the gospels. He asserts that the four gospels, taken in a literal sense, are "full of improbabilities, incredibilities, and gross absurdities; that they are like Gulliverian tales of persons and things which, out of the romance, never had a being; that neither the Fathers, the Apostles, nor Jesus himself ever intended that his miracles should be taken in the literal, but in the mystical and parabolical sense." He casts base and scurrilous reflections on the character of our blessed Lord; and yet he charges the bishop of London with ignorance or malice, in representing him as a promoter of infidelity. Woolston was a clergyman of the church of England.

Dr. Tindall discovered his infidelity, in a work entitled, "Christianity as old as the Creation;" in which, though he pretends a high regard for the Christian religion, he uses his utmost efforts to discard *all revelation*, as useless and needless, and sets himself to expose and subvert the revelations contained in the Holy Scriptures. Those who wish for *positive* precepts in religion, Tindall honors with the name of Demonists, representing them as enemies to the exercise of reason, and even below the brutes.

Another attempt against religion was made in England by Dr. Morgan, in his book entitled, "The Moral Philosopher." Though he professes himself a Christian, "on the footing,"

as he says, "of the New Testament," still, he insinuates reflections on the character of the Saviour, and endeavors to invalidate the attestation given to Christianity, by the bestowment of miraculous powers. He represents the apostles as preaching different gospels, and the New Testament as a jumble of inconsistent religions. Doctors Tindall and Morgan honored themselves and their followers with the appellation of *Christian Deists.*

In the posthumous writings of Mr. Chubb, notwithstanding all his professions to the contrary, he clearly shows himself an enemy to Christianity. He does not allow a particular providence, or admit that prayer to God is a duty. He seems in doubt with respect even to a future state of existence. He absolutely rejects the Jewish Scriptures, but expresses a very favorable opinion of the religion of Mahomet.

In the year 1742, Mr. Dodwell published his famous pamphlet, entitled "Christianity not founded on Argument." Under the semblance of great zeal for the Christian religion, he endeavors to show, that this religion has no foundation in *reason*, but rests on "a constant and particular revelation or inspiration, imparted separately and supernaturally to each individual."

Near akin to this were the sentiments of Mr. Hume, as expressed in the conclusion of his Essay on Miracles. He represents those as "dangerous friends or disguised enemies to the Christian religion, who undertake to defend it on the principles of human reason. Our most holy religion," says he, "is founded on *faith*, not on *reason*, and it is a sure method of exposing it, to put it to such a trial, as it is by no means fitted to endure." That Mr. Hume discarded the Christian revelation, there can be no doubt. The probability is, that he went much farther than this, questioning even the Divine existence, and laboring to subvert the deep foundations of morality and truth. He involved himself, and strove to involve others, in a universal skepticism.

Lord Bolingbroke was a vain, flippant, arrogant, outrageous infidel, though, like most who preceded him, he endeavored to cloak his infidelity under professions of regard for the Christian religion. Thus, while he tells us, in one place, that "genuine Christianity is taught in the gospel"—that "it is the word of God," and as such "requires our

strict conformity to it," he proceeds to say, that "it is no less than blasphemy to assert the Jewish Scriptures to have been divinely inspired," and that those who attempt to justify them are worse than Atheists, though they may pass for saints." He charges the Apostle Paul with "dissimulation, falsehood, and even with madness." He asserts that Paul's "gospel was different from that of Christ, and contradictory to it;"—that "he writes confusedly, obscurely, and unintelligibly;"—and that where his writings are intelligible, "they are often absurd, profane, and trifling." The real sentiments of Bolingbroke were not fully disclosed, until the publication of his works, subsequent to his decease.

The attacks of Gibbon on Christianity were rather in a way of sneer and sarcasm, than of direct argument or assertion. It would be hard to convict him of palpable falsehood, in any of the statements in his learned history; and yet his statements are often so discolored, not to say distorted, as to have all the effect of falsehood on the mind of the reader.

It should be added here, that as these infidel writers appeared, one after another, on the stage, they were met by able and successful opponents, who removed their objections, exposed their sophisms, and solidly refuted their specious reasonings. The following are the names of those who distinguished themselves in this protracted infidel controversy: Baxter, Halyburton, Whitby, Ward, Clark, Warburton, Chandler, Sherlock, Lardner, Stackhouse, Lowman, Doddridge, Benson, Littleton, Campbell, Watson, and West.

I have dwelt the longer on the names and works of the older English infidels, because on them rests the responsibility of opening a fountain, whose poisonous streams have deluged half Europe. From them, the virus was conveyed into France, and from France into Germany, and back again into England, and to the United States; and it is of the Lord's mercies that the foundations of religion and of social order have not, by this means, been utterly subverted.

It is a remarkable fact that, until within the last half century, nearly all the infidels in the civilized world have thought proper to cloak their infidelity under professions of regard for the Christian religion. Thus did all those, without an exception, whose names have been mentioned. They talked of the excellent morality of the gospel, and of its Divine author. Instead of declaring themselves to be infi-

dels, some of them insisted that they only were to be regarded as wise and consistent Christians. They were clearing away the rubbish by which Christianity had been obscured, and laboring to restore it to its primitive purity. Even Voltaire "always professed himself a Christian, and continued to do so on his death-bed. He seldom enters into direct and serious argument against the gospel, which he did not understand, but throws the shafts of his ridicule all around him, and treats Judaism with the utmost contempt."

The same also may be said of Rousseau. He was first a Protestant, then a Catholic, and afterwards a Protestant again; and all this confessedly to answer a sinister, secular design.

The same policy, or rather hypocrisy, is still practised extensively in Germany. Not a few of the Christian teachers and theological professors of that once favored land are at this moment Deists, if not Atheists. One of them tells us that "the prophets delivered the offspring of their own brains, as divine revelations." Another says, "the narrations in the New Testament, true or false, are only suited for ignorant, uncultivated minds, who cannot enter into the evidence of natural religion." A third speaks of St. John's portion of the New Testament as "inconsistent with itself, and made up of allegories." A fourth glories in having given "a little light to St. Paul's darkness; a darkness," he thinks, "industriously affected." A fifth represents Joshua's account of "the conquest of Canaan as fictitious;" the books of Samuel as "containing a multitude of falsehoods;" and Daniel as "full of stories, contrived, or exaggerated by superstition." A sixth insists, that "God could not have required of Abraham so horrible a crime as the offering up of his son, and that there can be no palliation or excuse for this pretended command of the Deity." A seventh explains the effusion of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost as an electric gust, and the effects which followed as enthusiasm. An eighth suggests that Peter stabbed Ananias, which, says he, "does not at all disagree with the vehement and easily exasperated temper of Peter." A ninth teaches, that "the Pentateuch was composed about the time of the captivity; that the Jewish ritual was of gradual formation, accessions being made to it by superstition; and that the books of the Chronicles, which are filled with scraps and inconsistencies, were

foisted into the canon by some of the priesthood, who wished to exalt their own order." I surely need not adduce farther evidence, that many of the professed teachers of religion in Germany, in the last age and in the present, are no better than infidels.

I might here advert to the acknowledged fact, that no small part of the educated Romish clergy in France, and in other parts of the world, are disguised infidels. They know no other Christianity than that of Rome, and they soon come to adopt the sentiment of Leo Xth, that this is a fable, though to them a gainful one.

Thomas Paine was one of the first, in modern times, who set the example of *open, avowed* infidelity. His example was soon followed by the political infidels of France, under whose direction the Bible was burnt, in a public square, by the common hangman; the Christian Sabbath was abolished; the houses of public worship were shut up; the sacramental vessels were mounted on the back of an ass, and paraded through the streets; and an inscription was written on the gate of their burying-place, "Death is an eternal sleep."

The writings of Paine, and the example of the revolutionary infidels of France, exerted a powerful influence in this country. At the commencement of the present century, infidelity was decidedly popular and alarmingly prevalent in the United States. The chief magistrate of the Union was well known to be an infidel. Dr. Franklin was generally believed to be a secret supporter of the same doctrine. In many of our colleges, infidelity not only existed, but triumphed; in consequence of which a large proportion of our educated young men came forth into the world infidels.

It is said, in the life of the late Dr. Dwight, that at the time of his inauguration to the Presidency, "infidelity was decidedly fashionable and prevalent in Yale College. A considerable proportion of the students had assumed the names of the principal English and French Infidels, and were more commonly known by them, than by their own. An impression existed generally among the students, that Christianity was supported by authority, and not by argument, and that their instructers were afraid to meet the question of the inspiration of the Scriptures, in the field of open and fair discussion." This impression Dr. Dwight took care very early and effectually to dissipate; and it is due to

the memory of this great man to say, that he did more, probably, than any other individual, to check the growth of infidelity in this country.

There is undoubtedly much lurking infidelity still existing in Great Britain and the United States. It gives me pleasure, however, to be able to say, that I think there is less of it, than there was forty years ago. Certainly it appears with a less imposing aspect—with a less bold and open front. It shuns, rather than seeks the light, and prefers to be known by some name more respectable than its own. It becomes those who are set for the defence of the gospel to bear in mind, however, that the enemy is not dead, but sleepeth. Or perhaps I might better say, *he does not sleep.* He merely watches his opportunity to come forth, join battle under more favoring auspices, and retake the strong holds from which he has been driven.

Let all those who stand on the walls of our Zion be ready for the onset. The weapons of their warfare have been often tested. Their shield and sword and helmet have been thoroughly proved. If the enemy is permitted to gain any new advantage, the fault will be all their own.

ARTICLE VII.

The Religious Character of a Nation the Element of its Prosperity.

By Rev. George Duffield, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Detroit, Michigan.

The practical infidelity of modern times is nowhere more conspicuous, than among our public men, who have the direction of our great national interests. The dreamings of this and the other political economist are heeded, in preference to the sober maxims inculcated in the sacred Scriptures. To be swayed by the truths *they* teach, and to avow their influence on the opinions and judgments they form, with respect to the policy and administration of the government, are accounted weakness and superstition. The

valuable aid they furnish, and the sound principles they urge, for the efficient development of the resources of the country, are practically undervalued and disbelieved; and that, notwithstanding the history of nations is one perpetual confirmation and illustration of the great principles of political economy recognised and taught in them.

A thousand expedients may be adopted for the public weal, but all will prove abortive, or fail to secure permanent prosperity, where the religious character of a people is not prized and fostered. There can be no guaranty for public tranquillity, whatever may be a people's confidence in their fleets or armies, their legislation and judiciary, the policy and efficiency of their administration, if the laws and providence of God are disrespected. An attentive observer cannot fail to discover indications of evil, among the population of this land. The fears of many are awake for the future. The spirit of lawlessness and violence, the practical disrespect of God's law, and of the institutions of Christianity, which mark the signs of the times, cannot but excite solicitude. Under the influence of such solicitude the following attempt is made to prove that the *religious character of a people is the true element of their prosperity, and to trace some of the more striking indications of deterioration, in this respect, in the United States.*

By the religious character of a people is meant the practical influence of true Christianity. Other religions have obtained credit in the world, and shaped the character of nations; but none possess equal power to promote the real and permanent improvement of a people:—the remark is made in reference to their temporal condition. Christianity commends itself to every class in society, and is the only effectual means of securing those healthful developments in which true social prosperity consists.

We propose not to enter at large upon the arguments in proof of this position, aiming more directly at the application;—but there are two considerations, which every candid reader will acknowledge to be conclusive. If we can show that religion elevates the condition, and augments the happiness of society, beyond every thing else, we have done all that can be demanded of us. In what then, we ask, consists the elevation and happiness of a nation? Not in the splendor of its government? Not in the grandeur and superior

refinement of its rulers? Not in the wealth and luxury of a privileged and noble class? Not in the security and efficient control of a pampered aristocracy? Not in the strength and glory of its armies and navy? These may all be had, as history has proved, and yet the great mass of the people be oppressed, degraded, corrupt, and little of domestic peace and tranquillity be known.

The elevation and happiness of society can only be secured by the elevation and happiness of the different families and members composing that society. Nothing can be effectual for this end, which does not enter the household and the heart, and contribute to produce and promote intelligence, order, contentment and industry. These form the main elements of national prosperity. Wherever they exist diffusely among the mass, there must be both national happiness and national aggrandisement. We say nothing of the tendency of Christianity to elevate and bless, as it makes the subject of its influence aspire to the society of God, of the spirits of just men made perfect, of the angels who kept their first estate, the loftiest intelligences—the best society in the universe, —as it thus, of necessity, expands and strengthens the mind, and as it throws in the radiance of hope and joy, by unfolding the prospect of future scenes, of high and ennobling immortality; but we speak only of its improvement of men's temporal condition.

Let the appropriate influence of religion find its way into the different families that compose a community, and there you will see the most effectual restraints imposed on discord and strife, and the most powerful incentives to promote order, intelligence, contentment and industry. For he that is actuated by religion is affected by the fear of God, and the fear of God is a much more powerful principle than the fear of human laws, or of the authorities intrusted with the execution of those laws. The ignorant and impoverished are apt to feel, that the laws and the government are their enemies, or at any rate, that, while society owes them a subsistence, it does by these means throw obstacles in the way of their receiving it. So far from having respect to the general order and happiness of society, they are willing to sacrifice all to their selfishness, and to prevent confusion and mischief, rapaciousness and crime, the strong hand of power, with all the accompaniments of courts and jails, penitentiaries and military force, must inspire terror.

This fear is not effectual; the fear of God, however, is. It accompanies the man affected by it into all the intercourse of life, and sheds its controlling influence over all his conduct. When true religion enters the cottage of the thief or drunkard, or the palace of the proud oppressor, it brings its own peculiar energies to bear upon their inmates. It starts no philosophical discussions about public morals, the comforts of sobriety, the advantages to be derived from holding sacred the rights of property, or the necessity of civil government for the general weal. It takes a much more direct method to accomplish its ends. It asserts and exalts the law of God, which requires, "As ye would that others do to you, do ye even so to them." It requires that each man regard and love his neighbor and his brother, as himself. It pours out the denunciation of Heaven, and threatens with eternal damnation every one, both high and low, who dares to violate its high behests. It imparts a few simple and salutary principles, and engraves them on the tablets of the heart, so that its subject can never plead ignorance, but carries with him, through all the varieties of human condition, and complicated human relations, his guide and instructer in the path of duty; "teaching us to deny all ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously and godly, in this present evil world;" "to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates," to render unto all men their dues, "tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor, to owe no man, but to love one another;" "to put away all anger and malice," envy and revenge, those stormy passions, which keep society agitated and unsettled, and to abstain from all lying and backbiting and reviling. It is obvious that nothing possesses half so much intrinsic power, or is so admirably and universally adapted to diffuse throughout the community a love of order, a respect for the laws, the spirit of contentment and good-will, and the diligent efforts of a healthful industry,—the very elements of public prosperity.

Did space permit, we could show how religion meets man in the lowest depths of his degradation and misery, and, speaking in the soft tones of heavenly mercy, words of peace and encouragement, inspires him with hope, and prompts him to commence a thorough renovation of his life;—how it meets him in his helplessness, and when through conscious

weakness, and fear of temptation, he scarcely dares to form a resolution to change, it proffers its aid, directs him to the "treasures of wisdom, and of strength laid up for him in Jesus Christ, and persuades him to hope and believe there is salvation for him;—how it meets him in his ignorance, and when he knows not where to look, what to do, in whom to trust, or from whom to take counsel, presents, as the friend and companion of his steps, the mighty Son of God, on whom to lean, and through whom to escape from every fear and foe;—how it meets him in his different relations, as parent, husband child, brother, friend, neighbor and subject, and vouchsafing its counsel and safe conduct through all the different and difficult circumstances of his condition, assists him in the discharge of every duty, and moulds his character after the graces of the Spirit of God, "against which there is no law;"—and how it meets him in his different trials and afflictions; the difficult passes through life, and administers courage and consolation, wiping away the tears of his sorrow, dissipating his anxiety about his own and his family's welfare, soothing him on the bed of sickness, comforting him in his afflictions, supporting him in his trials, fortifying him for disappointments, lifting him up in his despondency, exciting him with the hope of future good, dispelling the fear of death, throwing around him in his dying moments the arms of everlasting love, and pressing his spirit beloved to the bosom of his Heavenly Father.

There is nothing which lends such a mighty helping power to the suffering and oppressed, who with weary spirits and decaying energies, begin to lose their patience and their hope, while grappling with the hardships of life. There is nothing which can light up the humble abode of poverty with the bright sunshine of peace and hope, and dignify the privations, toils and sufferings incident to penury, and brace, with the firmness of heroic fortitude, the man who sees his scanty fare becoming more and more precarious, his children wasting with disease, and the partner of his cares sinking under the pressure of their trials. There is nothing which can so soften the rugged, polish the rude, enlighten the ignorant, sustain under heavy pressure, and direct under circumstances fraught with perplexity. Where was there ever such a magic power brought to bear upon a people to improve the condition of the poor? to expel discontent and

gloom? to substitute peace for anxiety, confidence for fear, hope for despondency, joy for sorrow, purity for pollution? Nothing can equal it, nothing compensate it. It is this, and this alone that can equalize the allotments of Providence, and place every man in a condition to rise to respectability and happiness.

Talk not of agrarian laws, or the equal distribution of property, to improve the condition of society! Suppose you could fill the land with families of opulence, you could not fill those families with happiness, not even with contentment. Wealth has no power to relieve from care, and fill the home and heart of its possessor with bliss. But introduce the religion of Jesus Christ among the people,—let it enter the households of the poor, and inspire the tenants of the humble cottage, with the hope of that inheritance which is "incorruptible, undefiled, and which fadeth not away;" and teach them how their trials, which are comparatively but for a moment, work out for them "a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory," yea, that their very poverty is proof of His favor, who hath chosen them "rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom," and you do more than all the legislation, wisdom and philosophy of man, and the resources of governments, can accomplish, to fill the land with contented and happy families, and ensure the greatest amount of happiness consistent with a state of moral discipline.

Let the records of history be consulted. Contrast the most refined and brilliant nations of antiquity, with those that Christianity has moulded, and civilized by its influence, and tell the result. The splendid monarchies and despotisms of Egypt, Nineveh and Babylon, of Persia, Greece and Rome, did indeed ennoble and exalt the crown and aristocracy, and dazzle the earth with the glory of their armies, the costliness of their palaces, the wonders of their architecture, and the richness, delicacy and extravagance of their luxuries; but they held the mass of the people oppressed, degraded, brutalized, with little or no knowledge of the bliss of domestic life. Nor did the proud republics of Greece and Rome accomplish more. They merged indeed the family in the state, and extinguishing the feeling of individuality in the paramount and absorbing claims of the body politic, afforded but little opportunity to indulge and cultivate the domestic virtues, or ply the means, or know the sources of domestic happi-

ness. The government was not the guardian angel of the people's happiness, protecting them in their inalienable rights, and facilitating the development of their powers, and the attainment of their happiness, in the exercise of those rights, but the people were led to sacrifice their individual and domestic enjoyments for the welfare and glory of the government. Their laws and public institutions tended not to equalize and diffuse the means of happiness, but to concentrate the sacrifices of individual and domestic happiness in the glory of the republic. And hence they never could perpetuate their republics, or protect themselves against the encroachments and ambition of aspirants after fame and power. Corruption and ignorance increased, and on the ruin of public morals, and amidst the prevalence of public distress, designing demagogues, through flattery and deceit, persuaded them to erect the despot's throne.

We look in vain to the governments of earth, which have not felt the influence, or owned the authority of Christianity, for any of those great and permanent results, which are dear to every friend of virtue and humanity. What influence but that of Christianity has ever banished gross vices from their public haunts, and forced their perpetrators to hide them in the darkness of secrecy? We look in vain for the universal diffusion of the blessings of a wholesome moral education, for the creation and endowment of hospitals, infirmaries, asylums, houses of refuge, and other kindred institutions, which Christianity has scattered so profusely among modern nations, for the relief and mitigation of the sufferings of the helpless and wretched.

Where have you found among the nations of antiquity any thing like the influence which Christianity has exerted, and is still exerting, to eradicate slavery from the earth, and break the yokes and fetters which cupidity and cruelty had forged? It is to Christianity the world is indebted for the elevation of the female sex from that degradation and servile condition in which they were held by the ancient heathen, and are yet held among anti-Christian nations;—for those happy influences which have meliorated the state of human society, consecrated the ties which bind together the husband and wife, the parent and child, and introduce to our firesides all the virtues which sweeten every domestic relationship, and give endearments to home;—for the laws which pro-

tect the weak from the rapacity of the strong, the widow in her solitude, the orphan and the fatherless from the cunning and arts of those who would rob them of their rights, and for that sound healthful public opinion which alone can furnish an effectual guaranty against the evils, infallibly and abundantly resulting from the disrespect of oaths, the venality of of judges, the violation of public pledges, the treachery of public servants, the default of public officers, the recklessness of corrupt legislation, the chicanery of the bar, the subserviency of public functionaries, the selfishness of mercenary individuals, the cupidity of swindlers, and the dishonesty and vindictiveness of monied corporations.

"If you are in search of the attributes which give dignity to a state," says an eloquent divine, "of the virtues which shed a lustre and loveliness over families, give value to what is magnificent in enterprise, refined in civilization, lofty in ethics, admirable in jurisprudence, you never think of turning to any but a Christianized territory, in order to obtain the most signal exhibition; and just in proportion as Christianity but gains a footing on the territories of heathenism, there is a distinct improvement in whatever tends to exalt a nation and bring comfort and respectability to its households."* It has ever proved itself to be the "great civilizer of nations, the great heightener of morals, the soother of the afflicted, the patron of the destitute, the friend of the oppressed. Of a nation under its control, and by whom its restraints are reverenced and cherished, it may well be said, "Happy is the people that is in such a case, yea, happy is that people whose God is the Lord."

Is this the happiness of our nation? We have reason to bless God that we yet feel the benefit of those laws and institutions, of those influences and customs, of those conservative maxims and social morals, and of that healthful public opinion, which are peculiar to Christianity. We have reason too to rejoice in the belief that the God who has done such great things for us has not yet cast us off. But while we rejoice, we have much cause to do it with fear and trembling. For while it is demonstrable, that Christianity alone secures permanent prosperity, and the highest amount of happiness to a nation,—that the righteousness it teaches ex-

* Melville.

alts a nation,—and that the sin it reproves is a reproach to any people, we cannot shut our eyes to the evidence, which meets us at every turn, that the conservative influences, and restraints of Christianity, among our population, have been greatly impaired.

We look back to the days of our infancy and admire the heroic virtues and Christian integrity of our Pilgrim Fathers, and the happy adaptation of their laws and manners for the rapid and amazing developments, which have placed us, like the young giant in the first vigor of his manhood, among the nations of the earth. Would that no symptoms of disease had made their appearance! The present condition and future prospects of our beloved country, however, cannot fail to excite the uneasiness and fears of every patriot and philanthropist, who feels that the religious character of a people is the true element and best guaranty of their public prosperity.

We are indeed aware, that political men are apt to turn away with disgust from what they call the croakings of the pulpit or the alarms of prophets and seers. But moral causes can be traced, with as much certainty to their results, as physical; and to shut the eyes and refuse to see where dangers threaten, is only one among the many indications which the history of ages has proved, are always given of an approaching crisis. Just in proportion as we discover that the religious character of a people suffers injury, that the great barriers which Christianity rears against the spreading of corruption are broken down, and that her appropriate and efficient influence to enlighten, purify and bless the great mass of the population are impaired, must we anticipate "a day of trouble, of treading down, and of perplexity."

In applying, therefore, the truth we have been contemplating, to the circumstances and character of this nation, we feel that, however painful may be the task, it is one calculated to make us grateful for what we yet enjoy, and to evince that gratitude by our anxious efforts to prevent, if possible, any further deterioration. What then are the great public indications observable, that, as a nation, we have dishonored, if not disowned, that God, the blessing of whose providence is the only sufficient bulwark of our safety? In other words, are there any vices or states of public feeling and sentiment among us, which are at war with the genial and protective influences of Christianity?

In detailing the prevalent crimes which peril our prosperity, and subject us to the displeasure of God, our attention shall be confined to those which characterize either the great mass of our population, or many of our conspicuous and influential men, occupying places of trust and power, or which have interwoven themselves with the administration and legislation of the country.

Intemperance leads the van. What multitudes of loathsome drunkards and tipplers are to be seen, throughout the length and breadth of this land, loitering about the numerous taverns and grog-shops which a mistaken policy prompts our civil authorities to license for the retail of intoxicating liquors? How is the industry of the country impaired, the happiness of numerous families destroyed, the youth corrupted, the miserable victims of a squalid poverty multiplied, the heavy taxes, which drain the profits of the industrious and frugal citizen for the support of an extensive system of criminal justice, for the erection and maintenance of jails, penitentiaries, and pauper establishments, increased—the lives of hundreds and thousands, who might have proved valuable citizens cut short—the hopes, prospects and usefulness of many of our promising youth blighted—diseases of every type and form, to afflict and torture, induced—and the very staff of life converted into deadly poison, by the demands of this hydra vice! No class of the community has escaped from its ravages. The sot may be found in our chairs of state, our legislative halls the judges' seats, and even in the sacred desk. The temples of Bacchus far outnumber the temples of Jehovah; and the still small voice of the gospel of peace, and purity, is drowned in the shouts of the inebriate.

It is true, that a redeeming influence has gone forth, and the temperance reformation has called away many from the Bacchanalian revel, and prevented others from entering the walks of this lubberly divinity,—but much, very much yet remains to be done; nor can we account ourselves safe from its pestilential breath, till habits of total abstinence become more prevalent, and the legislation of our country ceases to legalize and sanction the distribution of the maddening cup.

Close in the rear of intemperance, follow profanity, sensuality, and various forms of lewdness, with crowds of angry broils and contentions, personal assaults and menaces, and

the blood-stained hands of rioters, homicides and murderers. The increase of profanity, especially among the youth, the boys of the country, the licentious disrespect of marriage and the marriage vow, and of horrid deeds of murder, within a few years past, is very observable. The remarks of the prophet may be repeated: "By swearing, and lying, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery, they break out, and blood toucheth blood; therefore, does the land mourn." The increase of these things is mournful proof that we are fast losing our religious character as a people.

A third class of crimes, which have worked extensive mischief among us, and for which we are now suffering in the confusion and distress which prevail in money matters, is the spirit of adventurous cupidity, which, impatient to toil by industry and frugality for wealth, and eager after large and rapid accumulation of property, has prompted to excessive speculation, extortion, expansion in business, immense credits, abuse of the whole system of credit, dishonest attempts to evade obligations, and avaricious and usurious efforts to take advantage of the necessities of others. The spirit of speculation, (which is but the gambling spirit,) has been extensively substituted for that of diligence and industry, to which alone God has promised the certain acquisition, and permanent possession of wealth. It is that evil covetousness, which, like the gambler's spirit, draws after it an endless train of *vices* and *ills*, and subjects those who indulge it, to the righteous denunciations of Him who has said: "Wo to him that coveteth an evil covetousness to his house, that he may set his nest on high, that he may be delivered from the power of evil. Thou hast consulted shame to thy house, thou hast taken usury and increase, and thou hast greedily gained of thy neighbors by extortion, and hast forgotten me, saith the Lord God. Behold, therefore I have smitten my hand at thy dishonest gains which thou hast made." The innocent have been involved with the guilty here; and whatever we may think about the proximate or political causes which have produced the late revulsion, one thing is certain, it is the retribution of Heaven; and the spasm of distress, in which the whole country now writhes, is but a legitimate consequence of a departure from those principles of uprightness and integrity, which Christianity enjoins, as well in commercial and financial as in other transactions.

Among the corrupt developments, which indicate a loss of religious character, is the growing disrespect for the sacred obligation of an oath. The time was, when Christianity was avowed and felt to be the religion of this country, and when its influence was respected and cherished, that less of the crimes of smuggling, false swearing, and disrespect of official oaths on the part of public servants, and of the obligations of good citizenship, marked the American than any other people. Alas! how changed have we become. The fear of God presides not always in our custom-houses, or our courts of justice; and even the fear of man throws less and less of its protective influence around.

This is but the legitimate consequence of another sad symptom of our departure from God—the disrespect and desecration of the Sabbath. Among all the institutions of religion, none possesses more conservative power, than the regular observance of a sacred day of rest, to be appropriated, with the recurrence of each week, to the worship of Almighty God. Without this, the other institutions of Christianity lose more than half their efficiency. The sanctuaries will be deserted, the preaching of the gospel circumscribed, the rites of religion forgotten, and the day, designed and adapted for intellectual, moral and religious improvement, and which throws the Ægis of its protection around the virtues, health and happiness of a people, become the fruitful occasion of idleness, dissipation, and incurable corruption in the young and rising generation. Yet, this day has lost much of its controlling and sanctifying influence over the minds and hearts of a very large proportion of our population. What hosts of merchants travel through the length and breadth of our land on this day! Business is transacted in stores, warehouses, and landing-places, in different parts of our country. Hundreds of cars and steamboats press their way along our numerous rail-roads and rivers, bearing crowds of passengers and heavy freights, impatient of its restraints. Stages and wagons line our public roads, thousands of recesses, restaurateurs, petty groceries, taverns and hotels, are thrown open, on that day, for the traffic in intoxicating liquors, and gather crowds of the dissolute and inebriate. The laws for enforcing its observance have become a dead letter. Our post-offices are opened for the receipt and delivery of letters and mails

Even the halls of our legislative chambers are not exempt from its profanation. Its desecration, by the transportation of the mails, has been legalized; petitions for reformation have been disregarded; and examples have been set, by men of influence and station, which sanction the growing indifference of multitudes to the claims of that sacred day.

We bring no railing accusations against any; it is not our province to do so; but we cannot be blind to the fact, whatever may be the modes of extenuating or apologizing for it, that the Sabbath has much less hold upon the consciences and affections of the great mass of the community than it formerly had.

We fear that we shall be suspected of indulging in lugubrious strains, but the detail of proof that our religious character, as a nation, has been impaired, is by no means exhausted. There is a national sin, sanctioned by the constitutions of several of the states, and allowed by that of the United States, by which we stand before the world accused of contradicting, by our usages, as well the declaration of of our independence, as the dictates of Christianity. Nor can we omit to mention the measures pursued by our government, to drive the aborigines of our forests from the soil consecrated by the footsteps and the ashes of their fathers; the horrid scenes of beastly intemperance, and the abundant opportunities for defrauding and extorting from the miserable inebriates, presented by the distribution of annuities; and the sufferings and ravages of disease and death occasioned by the removal of the tribes and the cupidity of the contractors.

In addition to all these, we can discern various indications of a corrupt and diseased state of public sentiment and feeling, directly at war with the genial influence of Christianity and the conservative power of our institutions. We allude to the very common, and often boldly avowed doctrines, that our public servants, intrusted with the enactment of laws, are to obey the will and wishes of their constituents, whatever they may be, whether dictated by ignorance or malice, irreligion or infidelity; and in their obligations to the people, to lose sight of their obligations to God, their Maker and their Judge, which bind them to the observance of His law, and to the discouragement of vice and immorality; to the maxims and spirit of party, which are at war with the free exercise of the

elective franchise; to the bribery, corruption and perjury, which are not deemed inappropriate to secure the election of party candidates; to the practical influence of the notion, that the successful candidate elected is the representative, not of the whole population, but only of his own party constituents; to the recklessness and utter disregard manifested as to the moral character of the men nominated for offices; to the spirit of insubordination which displays itself among the youth, and the absence of parental authority in the families of the land; to the spirit of violence, which brooks not delay, but urges forward the angry mob, or the self-constituted lynch-judges, to gratify their thirst for vengeance, by trampling the laws and authorities under their feet, and inflicting what is called "summary justice" on the objects of their hatred; to the utter indifference manifested towards the obligations and sacred treaties which bind the government, while a rapacious spirit of plunder dignifies itself with the epithets of patriotism, or the love of liberty, or sympathy with the oppressed; to the vituperative and defamatory character of the political press, which delights to traduce and destroy the reputation of our public men, or candidates for office; to the party antipathies and sectional jealousies which are engendering dangerous factions, and threaten the severance of the once happy ties which bound together these United States.

But the heart grows sad with the recital. The result of these things, if not checked and corrected, is certain; yet, zeal for our country's welfare excites hope in the midst of despondency; and, numerous as may be the proofs of deterioration, and fearful and ominous as may be the prospect before us, the conviction still sheds its cheering influence, that we have enough of Christianity left to retrace our steps, and, by repentance and reformation, recover the ground we have lost. Some rays of light still fall upon the darkness, and direct us to the remedy. The standards of morality and religion are on the advance, notwithstanding the abounding of impiety and lawlessness. A love for our republican institutions yet operates. Our folly has been rebuked. We are suffering a wholesome discipline, which, though it has almost prostrated the commerce of the country, and produced universal embarrassment, is, nevertheless, working

health and cure, and will eventually, by securing a disgust for luxurious extravagance and waste, the study of retrenchment and economy, the practice of industry and frugality, and the cultivation of the virtues of private character, restore prosperity.

We talk of millions lost by reckless speculations, and the depreciation of property. But if the loss will check the spirit of evil covetousness that prevailed, the thirst for accumulated wealth, the taste for extravagance and luxury, the power and influence of dangerous monopolies, and lead to the development of the industry and resources of the country, the diligent and laborious cultivation of the soil, the reformation of former and existing evils, and a return to habits of virtue and integrity, a care for the proper education of our youth, a respect for religion, and for the purity and simplicity which marked the halcyon days of our beloved Washington, we shall not have purchased these things at too dear a rate. Where Christianity exerts its influence, ten thousand forms of social and domestic bliss, throw out their sparkling lustre, and reveal the fact, that—"Happy is the people that is in such a case; yea, happy is that people whose God is the Lord."

ARTICLE VIII.

The Present State of the Jewish Religion.

By Mr. E. S. Calman, Missionary to the Jews in Palestine.

Introductory Note.—By the Editor.

The following article is a communication from Mr. Calman, written as long ago as 1836, and addressed to two friends in England, by whom he is supported in his missionary labors. It was copied by the Rev. Eli Smith, then at Beyroot, and sent to the former editor of the Repository, but its publication has been delayed, by request of the author, for the purpose of obtaining the consent of his friends in England. We are now

gratified in being allowed to present it to our readers. It is accompanied with every evidence of veracity and candor, in the writer, and contains many things which to us are new and instructive. It will constitute a valuable addition to our stock of knowledge of the sufferings of the Jews, and of the internal state and existing spirit of the Jewish religion.

To put the reader more fully in possession of the character and circumstances of the writer, we insert the following extract from Mr. Smith's letter accompanying the MS.

"Mr. Calman is himself an Israelite, and a thoroughly educated Rabbi; but now a simple and warm-hearted believer in Jesus of Nazareth. He was born in Poland, where a childless and rich uncle adopted him in order that, according to the belief of the Jews, he might pray him out of purgatory upon his death; and who, upon his decease, sent him to another relation in Courland, to be educated. Here, losing the property he had inherited from his deceased uncle, through the management of relatives, he was educated for the service of the synagogue, and became the Rabbi of the place where he lived. Hoping to increase his income, he subsequently went to Riga, where the Jews are numerous, and practised the profession, religious and highly honorable among the Jews, of superintending the slaughter of animals for the Jewish market. Having providentially escaped, here, an act of Russian despotism, which endangered his life, and being joined by a dear friend and townsman, who had just been banished with all the Jews from St. Petersburgh at the accession of Nicholas, he quitted Russia for Germany.

At Berlin, the chief Rabbi of all Prussia, having duly examined him, gave him a diploma authorizing him to act as Rabbi in any part of the kingdom, upon the strength of which he obtained a situation. But, being unable, as a foreigner, to reside there longer, he left at the end of a year for Amsterdam, having parted with his friend at Berlin. From Amsterdam, mere curiosity to see London, before going back to Russia, whither he had concluded to return, brought him to England. Here, while seeking a place as Rabbi, he most unexpectedly encountered again his friend and townsman. Visiting the room of this friend one day when he was absent, he found the New Testament open upon his table. So shocked was he, that he at once, not only threatened to write to his relatives, but never to have any thing more to say to him himself. So affected was

the other, that, with tears, he promised to give up the book, which he had at first accepted merely to gratify a friend whom he had known at St. Petersburgh.

This friend of Mr. C.'s however, before long, began to propound difficulties in the Talmud, which led to much discussion. At length, to avoid the presence of other Jews, they spent their evenings regularly in discussion, at an inn. After proceeding a month or two in this manner, Mr. C. found his veneration for the Talmud materially diminished. At length it was laid aside, and its veil of mysticism being thus withdrawn from the Old Testament, he found the sacred oracles a new book. Whole nights were spent in reading them; and as he came to one prophecy after another respecting the Messiah, the joy of his heart expressed itself in floods of tears. And he actually found himself a believer in Jesus of Nazareth before he reached the New Testament.

Such is the early history of one whom I have learned to love as a dear Christian brother. My first acquaintance with him was last spring at Jerusalem. Having left England, under the patronage of a few private individuals, as a missionary to the Jews in the East, he had proceeded first to Bagdad and then to Jerusalem, where I met him. But exposure and fatigue in crossing the desert of Arabia, had so affected his health, that he was then supposed to be in a confirmed consumption; and to find a milder climate than the cold and windy region of Jerusalem, he left at the same time with us for Beyroot. Here, I am happy to say, his health is so improved that he is about to return to Jerusalem, to engage in the work upon which his heart is most ardently fixed, that of preaching to his kindred according to the flesh, Jesus Christ and him crucified.

I would remark that the most entire confidence may be placed in Mr. Calman's statements. With a conscience remarkably sensitive in regard to veracity, has been joined a tender regard for his nation, to prevent him from exaggerating. I, however, found him disposed to keep back some statements for fear of seeming to defame his countrymen; and only by my urgent solicitations has he been induced to insert some things contained in this article."

The following is Mr. Calman's account of the present state of the Jews and their religion, with his strictures on some of the statements of Mr. Herschell.

In perusing Mr. Herschell's Brief Sketch of the Present State of the Jews,* I was struck with two observations which I think it my duty not to let pass without noticing, and expressing to you my opinion respecting them. The FIRST is the following:

"But I wish to state my conviction, that the expectations formed by many good men of the effects to be produced simply by the distribution of New Testaments among the Jews, and by sending out a few men to argue with them on certain Scriptural questions, are vain and extravagant; and expose many well-meaning persons who entertain them, to a constant succession of disappointments." pp. 22, 23.

To such a bold observation as this, my *first* remark would be, that we have ample evidence, and direct assurance from the Holy Gospel, (Mark 16: 15, Luke 24: 47,) that the measure of sending forth missionaries to proclaim salvation through Christ Jesus, unconnected with the example of the church, has been commanded by our divine Redeemer. This blessed injunction has never been revoked, nor was it issued under any such conditions or exceptions as this; that, if Israel would listen to the glad tidings of the gospel, then the disciples were to continue preaching, and if not, they should forbear. I perfectly agree with Mr. H. that the example of the true and genuine church of Christ would be a most expedient and effectual means of diffusing and inculcating the knowledge of the gospel upon those who walk in darkness. But where this desirable means is impracticable, I would decidedly say, that the church of Christ is under obligation to

---

* *A Brief Sketch of the Present State and Future Expectations of the Jews: in a Letter addressed to his Christian Friends. By Ridley H. Herschell.* (*Third Edition, very much enlarged.*) London: 1834. pp. 140, 18mo.

It appears that the author of this little volume is also a convert from Judaism, and his statements are doubtless worthy of credit. His work is important as containing some views of Judaism and the Jews, at present, which are new and probably just. It is however especially to be valued as having been the occasion of calling forth the more full and matured statements of Mr. Calman, in the present article, who has noticed the principal points in which the views of Mr. Herschell seem to be deficient or erroneous. [EDITOR.]

act upon the simple command of Christ mentioned above, following the example of the Apostles, and more especially that of Paul, who persevered in obeying the command of his Lord, even after he had become acquainted with the hardness and stubbornness of his brethren, not at all discouraged even by the slanderous reports of the Jews respecting the church of Christ. Acts 28: 22—26. Nor did he give up even after he had experienced the severest revilings and persecutions; but went on perseveringly in spite of every difficulty and discouragement, in accordance with what the Holy Ghost taught through him in 2 Cor. 2: 15, 16. Moreover, is not the gospel the power of God unto salvation to the Jew as well as to the Greek? And if so, then the question remains, "How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?' and how shall they preach except they be sent? As it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things."—If Mr. H.'s assertion is grounded upon the scanty effects which missionary exertion, and the distribution of the New Testament, have produced; what I have said above will show that this can never justify us in abandoning the duty of preaching salvation through Christ Jesus to those who are far from him. And I hope to show in the sequel, that in view of the effects produced, the case is not altogether so discouraging as some may suppose, but the contrary. For as far as my experience extends, I can decidedly say, that much has been done among the Jews through the above instrumentality.

Yet, knowing what I do of the spirit and measures too common to associations organized for the propagation of Christianity among the Jews, I feel constrained to make a few observations, tending to abate the boldness of Mr. H.'s remark. For I cannot myself avoid the conviction that such associations must ever be liable to disappointments. In what manner they are organized and conducted, you know very well. Pamphlets and circulars, forwarded to religious persons, bring them together, and after a short prayer, the object is set forth by the most eloquent and distinguished men of the assembly. And according to the excitement produced by their eloquence, is generally the amount of the contribution, or subscription, obtained. The guinea having been

given, the donor thinks he has done all that he is called upon to do, for the conversion of the ancient people of God, and expects to hear soon of the good effects produced by his liberality. Without ever supplicating in his prayers, either for the outpouring of the Spirit upon the benighted Jews, or that strength of faith and power of love may be given from on high to the poor tried missionary, he eagerly looks into the monthly publications, to find if that blessing has been given for which he has not prayed, expecting to purchase with gold and silver that precious treasure, the price of which, the Lord has stipulated, should consist of the *prayer of faith*. Being thus disappointed with the scanty success which the above publications report, he recalls his annual donation, supposing he may contribute it to a better and a surer object; or if he does not withdraw his guinea, he does his heart, and his interest. Thus it is not wonderful that such associations have so many times entangled themselves in pecuniary embarrassments. Their subscribers require continually new excitements to keep alive their first feeling of interest, just as oxen in ploughing require continually the goad to keep them in motion. Do you ask for the reason and origin of such erroneous feelings? They arise, if I mistake not, from not pursuing this blessed work upon right principles, and from right motives. Instead of being impressed with a sense of the duty, which the Lord has laid upon his disciples to preach salvation through his name, and laying the same for a foundation to stand upon, other plausible reasons are invented to suit the fancies of men. Were it not thus, they would not be so soon discouraged as we often see them to be, because the Lord does not crown their labors with success, but would easily surmount that trial of faith, as the prophets and apostles overcame, and performed their duty at the expense of their property, comfort, and even of their own lives. But you will not understand these remarks as aimed at all missionary societies. Some, I have reason to believe, have surmounted, in a great measure, this unfavorable state of things.

My SECOND observation would be; that the Jews have a higher claim on the church of Christ, than any heathen nation. For the Jews, being unable to distinguish between the genuine church of Christ, and the nominal Christians, who have always been their persecutors, spoilers, and deadly enemies, and indeed have now not forgotten their malignancy,

as I shall state hereafter, comprise them all in one phalanx, as persecutors, and profaners of God's name by worshipping idols; while the heathen have been exempt from at least nominal Christian persecution. The prophet Isaiah saith, by the Holy Ghost, "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God; speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned, for she hath received from the Lord's hand double for all her sins." Though this prophecy had a primary fulfilment in John the Baptist, who was the voice crying in the wilderness; yet I am led to think that it has also a reference to the genuine church of Christ, charging her to comfort his ancient people. They have literally received from his hand double for all their sins. Many, many nations have been instruments for executing God's wrath upon his people the Jews, but none more so than nominal Christians. Ninety-nine shares in a hundred of this work have been theirs. And if nominal Christians have thus acted as persecutors, and thereby caused the name of Jesus to be profaned; I would say that the genuine church of Christ ought to try to accomplish what the prophet saith: "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people," and thereby remove the stain that nominal Christians have brought upon Christianity.

Now in what way can such a glorious work be accomplished, while true Christianity is scarcely found, except in blessed England, and happy America? How shall the Jews of corrupt Poland, Russia, and the East, know that the genuine church of Christ have a great love toward them, and are actually a holy people, who do glorify God in all their deeds? Can there be any other way, than to send out to them fit persons, full of love, piety, meekness and self-denial, as the church's representatives, to assure them of her good will toward them, and at the same time to reprove nominal Christianity by their spirit of holiness, persevering love, and renunciation of all communion with nominal Christians? By such blessed means would the Jews not only be comforted, but would discover that some of those Christians whom they had indiscriminately taken for their deadly enemies, are their best friends, and love them for Christ's sake. Thus would the malignancy and prejudice they have hitherto entertained on account of the corruption of nominal Christianity be removed, and they would of course desist from

ascribing all the calamities that have befallen them in Christian countries, to the doctrines and commands of Christ in the New Testament. This unfavorable feeling being once removed, they would gradually advance to the investigation of the Christian Scriptures, and these, ere they had finished the gospel of Matthew, would inevitably speak to their consciences, that they had sinned against God, and against his anointed, in ascribing such unholy doctrines to him who is so holy and lovely.

Were the true church of Christ in any measure acquainted with the persecutions suffered by the poor Jews in Roman Catholic countries, their sympathies would be called forth far more than they have hitherto been, and they would also send delegates to condole and weep with them, for the hardships they endure. The church reads of the persecutions and cruelties of Roman Catholics, as a history of what has ceased to be. But I am certain that those who have resided in corrupt Poland, will not say so. They will have learned that Roman Catholicism is the same now, that it was in the darkest ages; and that, if its professors, and their leader the Beast, were not restrained by secular powers, they would soon assume their former authority of condemning every body to the flames, whose faith differed from theirs. At present the poor Jews are the chief victims of their ferocity, for they have no power to resist it. The fullest exhibition of their enmity and cupidity toward them, is made at Easter. To justify which, they have recourse to a most horrible legend, viz. that the Jews use Christian blood for the passover cakes. To fix this dreadful imputation upon them, they have even been accustomed there, to throw dead children whom they had transfixed, into the houses of some rich Jews, or into the synagogues, on some night before the commencement of the passover, and the next morning, surround the houses or the synagogues, and produce the children. As soon as this was done, the sentence was well known. The men and women were either committed to the flames, or executed upon the gallows, and their property divided among the persecutors, or consecrated to the church. Thousands of rich Jewish families have shared this fate, and every year were they liable to it, until the Russians took possession of the kingdom, in 1796, and abolished such infamous proceedings. Since that time, such a thing rarely happens, and if

it does, government gives it no countenance. Yet the Jews are now not exempt from the most dangerous attacks.

One instance will show the nature of these proceedings of the Roman Catholics against the Jews, and will further the object for which these remarks are introduced; viz. to show you the necessity of sending missionaries to the Jews who sojourn where corrupt Christianity exists, that they may counteract the evil effects produced upon their minds by such corruption and persecution, and at the same time to remonstrate with the Roman Catholics against their inhuman ferocity, thus procuring for the Jews, temporal relief and spiritual blessings. The instance I shall relate occurred at Neuenhaven, and is taken from a letter of the Rev. J. Stoefeld, printed in the monthly publication of the Jewish Society for Nov. 1834.—"I must tell you of a shocking event which took place about a fortnight ago in my sphere of labor. At Neuenhaven, in the county of Gulick, about three weeks ago, the fair was held, continuing for eight days; and the customary procession occurred, to which a great number of people ran from far and near. Now a fortnight ago, a Roman Catholic boy, five years and eight months old, was lost, and on the next Tuesday morning, his body was found in a field near that village, he having been killed by a thrust in his breast. After this the people, in that very dark Roman Catholic country, repeated to each other the old superstitious fable, that the Jews must have the blood of Christians, and that they had killed this child in order to get it. When they had thus, for some days, mutually stirred up their old enmity and hatred against the Jews, they destroyed a synagogue with all that was in it, in one village in the neighborhood, and in Neuenhaven itself, they broke into the houses of the only two Jewish families that live there, robbed them of all that could be taken away, and destroyed all other things. When I heard this eight days ago, I went immediately to visit these persecuted families, and to see in what I might be able to help them. The government on that very night sent soldiers, who were making diligent search to detect the murderers and ring-leaders, and all the persons who were active in the said persecution and robbery. Not one of the Jews lost his life, but one old man received some cruel strokes by which he might have been killed, if one had touched his head. The loss of these

two families is very great, and in the synagogue were destroyed five copies of the written word of God, of which the price of one copy is about $200 or £30 sterling. I mention this last circumstance, as perhaps a few of the friends of Israel may be willing to send a sum sufficient to furnish these poor sufferers with one new copy of the word of God, after the fashion in which they must have it at their public service. When I went to visit these Jews, I requested the Rev. Mr. Kalthoff, who lives about six English miles from that village, and who is very active for the welfare of Israel, to go with me; and it softened, visibly, the sorrows of these poor sufferers to see our sympathy and real love for them. But the Roman Catholics in that place were very much displeased that we should speak in defence of the Jews, and refute their error with respect to the use of blood. The enmity against this people has also appeared in other parts of this country, and different attacks have been planned. I therefore went to the Vicar-General of the Archbishop, who is not at present himself here, and requested he would charge all clergymen in this diocess to instruct the people respecting the above false charge, and I am happy to tell you that he has done so, and thus I hope that the present enmity will soon cease. The general superintendent of the Protestant Church in this province does likewise, at my request, send letters to the superintendents that they may request all clergymen to say a word in favor of the Jews, particularly with respect to the above-mentioned vulgar error. May it please the Lord to accompany this with his blessing to the real benefit of Israel, and also to the Christian church!"

The prevailing question among Christians is, "Where are the fruits of the above-mentioned benevolence and Christian duty towards the Jews?" To this inquiry I would answer: If one would take into due consideration the labor which is required to remove the heaps of rubbish that have been accumulating for centuries, by nominal Christianity and Roman Catholicism, and also the small number of missionaries who are scattered among the millions of Jews, and the short period which has elapsed since the commencement of these operations, no surprise would exist that the success has been no greater.

Wherefore I would remark, thirdly, that as far as my own experience goes, I may venture to say that a great work has

already been done among them. This conclusion I have drawn from the following observations. Not many years since if a Jew were in any measure religiously disposed, he would not have allowed himself to argue about Christianity, although the Jews from childhood are accustomed to argue on the most frivolous subjects. But if any thing respecting Christ were mentioned all would stop their ears, and the name of Jesus would be accompanied with every expression of imprecation and blasphemy, and a sentence of excommunication passed upon any, who either in public or private introduced such a discussion.

The following occurrence will illustrate my assertion. A Polish nobleman had for a factor a rich and learned Jew, whom he attempted to convert to Christianity. The latter listened, but feared to bring forward his objections. The nobleman not being satisfied without a decisive opinion from the Jew, urged him by threats and promises to reply to his arguments. At length he promised to search the Scriptures, and to give an answer after three days. Immediately upon reaching his home, however, and reflecting upon his promise, he began to tear the hair from his head with regret and anguish, lest he had left an impression upon the mind of the nobleman that he had been brought to some serious thoughts respecting Christianity. The three days were employed by the poor Jew in fasting and prayer, and when they had expired he went to the nobleman and passed sentence upon himself, at the same time defining the nature of the penance to be inflicted. In accordance with which, his tongue, hands and feet were mutilated, and he was thrown into the synagogue, where he expired in a few minutes.

Now I would mention the change which has taken place among the Jews in reference to this point, especially where missionaries have visited, and tracts and New Testaments have been distributed. They are not only willing to converse on the blessed subject of Christianity, but are also candid to acknowledge many doctrines which it once would have been highly criminal to have done. They formerly regarded Christianity as a system of religion, which had nothing to do with the Bible; and this prejudice exists even now in places unvisited by Protestant missionaries. But thanks be to God, through the united influence of these and of the Bible Society, the Lord has been pleased to lead many

of his ancient people to the knowledge of the true Messiah, and a much larger number to see that Christianity is built upon a rational interpretation of the Law and the Prophets.

They are also now in some measure acquainted with the nature of true Christianity, and have discovered that there are those who love them for Christ's sake ; contrary to what they have experienced from the resident nominal Christians of the lands in which they have sojourned.

I may also confidently assert that there are many among them who truly believe in the Lord Jesus, but are afraid to confess it publicly, like the priests who dwelt at Jerusalem in the time of our Lord. There is even now "a remnant according to the election of grace." I know several in the Holy Land who are thus kept from openly acknowledging the Lord, and have ventured to go to their chief Rabbi at Safed, and declare that they had been led to the conviction that Christ Jesus must be the true Messiah ; and by their own request this Rabbi sent for me, that, by our arguments they might be confirmed either in the faith of Christ, or in Judaism. The Lord so enabled me to exhibit the truth, as that the Rabbi himself became entangled in his own arguments. The subject was thus discussed for several hours, in a friendly manner, before several Rabbies. I scarcely heard the name of Christ blasphemed in all my discussions with them ; and those who were familiar with the New Testament, and the beauty of its doctrines and precepts, have ventured to declare publicly that Jesus Christ must have been a very good and wise man. From the respect which they paid to Mr. Nicolayson, and more particularly to me, I was led to suspect at first, that they doubted the sincerity of my profession, and I therefore inquired of them the meaning of their deference towards one who not many years since would have been the object of their utmost contempt and abhorrence. They all declared that they could discover in me the earnestness of my faith in Christ. I was frequently invited to their entertainments, where I was always conducted to a seat among their most respectable Rabbies ; and notwithstanding that the conversation soon turned upon Jesus Christ and him crucified, they did not diminish aught from their respect. I scarcely ever heard from their lips the reproachful name of מְשֻׁמָּד renegade, which not many years since would have been my only epithet among them,

Now I would inquire what has produced this change; chance, or the weapons of which the Apostle Paul speaks, which are not carnal, but spiritual? speculative reasoning, or the simplicity of faith? Doubtless every Christian knows what the weapons of our warfare are.—The seed has been cast upon the waters, and "he that goeth forth weeping, bearing the precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him." No being can tell what may be the success of a work which is accompanied by faith, hope, and prayer. We have not only the command of God to engage in it, but the promise is pledged for its success, when he says that every knee shall bow to the sceptre of his Son; and also, that, "as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."

The second point in which I differ vastly from Mr. H. is in reference to the present state of Judaism. He appears not to have scrutinized it deeply, but has exhibited its outward appearance, disconnected from its absurdities and superstitions, as an object of admiration, and expressed no pity at seeing the law of the living God turned into a root of bitterness, and its holy spirit into sensuality. If the Lord Jesus rebuked the Pharisees in his own days, for having made void the law of God by their traditions, how much more applicable is such a rebuke to the Jews now? You must not, for a moment, suppose that I mean to charge Mr. H. with falsehood. Far from it; for I must acknowledge that before I became acquainted with the Judaism of the East, or rather, before I had thoroughly looked into the state of religion and morals among them, in consequence of my labors here for the benefit of their souls, my own views were nearly like those of Mr. H. The more I have penetrated, however, into their real condition, the more do I pity them, and the stronger do I regard my obligations towards them. Many, many times has my heart been broken, and my tears fallen for them. The same motives have led me to examine into the state of Judaism in Europe.

In the Holy Land, which is now its garrison and strong hold, may be found a criterion by which to judge of its condition in other lands; since here are to be found spiritual Jews from every part of the world, whose professed zeal and holiness have brought them hither, and of course their Judaism must be of the first stamp, and worthy to be the standard of all their captive brethren.

Before I enter into details, however, let me first say a few words in self-vindication, for exposing the nakedness of my own nation, especially as regards their religious state. I would not have attempted it, but from the fear that you would take Mr. H.'s delineation as a correct statement of the real condition of Judaism. I thought it my duty to make you acquainted with the *truth* of the matter, without any partiality, and I do not believe that you will think that I have ceased to love my brethren. Although I have not that overpowering affection which constrained the apostle to exclaim, that he could wish himself accursed from Christ for their sakes, yet, I thank God that I can sincerely say, that *I love them* in no small degree.

I will begin by stating one fact of great importance, of which I was totally ignorant before I came to this country, which will prove that the *seasons of the festivals*, appointed by God for the Jewish nation, have been annulled and subverted by the oral law of the Scribes and Pharisees, which is now the ritual of the Jews. The season for the feast of unleavened bread is thus defined in Exodus 13: 4: "This day came you out in the month Abib (אבִיב);" also, Ex. 23: 15. "Thou shalt keep the feast of unleavened bread seven days, as I commanded thee, in the time appointed of the month Abib," לְמוֹעֵד חֹדֶשׁ הָאָבִיב, literally, "at the season of the month of green corn," as it is evident from the parallel word in Ex. 9: 31: "And the flax and the barley was smitten, for the barley was אָבִיב in the ear."* But, at present, the Jews in the Holy Land have not the least regard to this season appointed and identified by Jehovah, but follow the rules prescribed in the oral law, namely, by adding a month to every second or third year, and thus making the lunar year correspond with the solar. And when the 15th day of Nisan (נִיסָן), according to this computation, arrives, they

* Compare Deut. 16: 9; Joshua 3: 15; 4: 19; 5: 10, 11, 12.

begin to celebrate the above-mentioned feast, although the חדש האביב may have passed, or not yet come. In general the proper season occurs after they have celebrated it a whole month, which is just reversing the command in the law, which directs that the חדש האביב precede the festival, and not the festival the חדש האביב. Nothing like ears of green corn have I seen around Jerusalem at the celebration of this feast. The Caraite Jews observe it later than the Rabbinical, for they are guided by Abib, אביב, and they charge the latter with eating leavened bread during that feast. I think, myself, that the charge is well-founded. If this feast of unleavened bread is not celebrated in its season, every successive festival is dislocated from its appropriate period, since the month Abib, אביב, is laid down in the law of God as the epoch from which every other is to follow. Oh! how true the words of our Lord, that through their traditions they make void the law.

I will now proceed to show in what manner the festivals are celebrated, which will clearly indicate that they are destitute of the spirit which God intended should characterize them. Indeed, how can spirituality and purity in the worship of Jehovah exist among those on whom the gospel light does not shine, and the door to it is hedged up by the corruptions of the Talmud? Such must inevitably grope at noon-day, as the blind gropeth in darkness.

The first feast of the ecclesiastical year is called פסח Pasahh, or *the feast of unleavened bread*, according to Ex. 23: 14 and 15. The first two days of it are kept by the higher class of educated Jews with decency and order, but the lower class generally, and the young women of every rank, spend these two days in playing with walnuts and making visits. In the next four days, which are called חל המועד, the profane days of the feast, some work is allowed, though seldom done, and the time is spent in holding the anniversaries of their different societies, for the purpose of making up their accounts and appointing officers. This business is always performed in the synagogue, and it never commences until mead, wine, and distilled spirits, are placed upon the table around which they are seated. As soon as one is selected for an office, and has received their congratulations, he expresses his satisfaction and gratitude by ordering more of these intoxicating drinks, and, of course,

the business seldom ends without a quarrel, and even more than this sometimes. The two last days are spent like the two first; the young females, both married and unmarried, pursuing their sports, and taking no interest in this or any other festivals, except as their *play* is concerned. This arises from their extreme ignorance; for the education of females is strongly prohibited by the Talmud, as I will more fully illustrate under another head.

One practice accompanying this feast should have been mentioned before, that of removing all kind of leaven from the house, and it is called בִּיעוּר חָמֵץ. It takes place on the day of preparation, called עֶרֶב פֶּסַח, in accordance with the command in Ex. 13: 7: "No leavened bread shall be seen with thee, neither shall there be leaven seen with thee in all thy quarters." To fulfil this law conveniently and outwardly, they resort to the following Talmudical trick. They sell all which undergoes fermentation, as a mere form, to Gentiles, and both the purchaser and the seller, and particularly the former, regard the bargain as only childish play; for distillers, whose articles amount to large sums, sell them to their Sabbath servants, who are Gentiles, and these being often too poor to return even a sixpence for the goods, the owners furnish them with a trifling sum, which the purchasers immediately pay back as surety. A contract, in the Hebrew language, is then delivered to the purchasers, who are likewise informed that the bargain is for a week only; of course both parties understand that the whole is a mere form. Thus the spirit of the command remains unfulfilled, and God is only mocked. And when they give leave to their Sabbath servants, or other Gentiles, to sell the above articles during the feast, they assign to them a place in the same house with themselves, which is often separated only by a curtain, that they may exercise such supervision over them, as to prevent dishonesty while they are trading, and also to secure the money in their own pockets before the others shall have time to abscond with it, as the possession of such large sums might tempt them to do.

Next comes the *feast of Pentecost*, as commanded in Levit. 23: 15—22. It is celebrated after the expiration of seven weeks from the offering of the sheaf, Lev. 23: 15. Now, however, they count from the time when the sheaf is supposed to have been waved in the temple, and which is a

subject of dispute between the Caraite and Rabbinical Jews. The former assert that the calculation should be made from a Sunday, according to Lev. 23: 11, 15: "And ye shall wave the sheaf before the Lord, to be accepted for you, *on the morrow after the Sabbath*."—"And he shall count unto you *from the morrow after the Sabbath*, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave-offering; seven Sabbaths shall be complete." This the Caraites take to mean the first Sunday of the feast of unleavened bread, and from that day they begin, accordingly, to compute the seven weeks; and if the first day of unleavened bread take place on Monday, they wait till the next Sunday, and then begin to count the seven weeks, which I think is correct. And if the waving of the sheaf of the first fruits is intended as a type of the resurrection of our Saviour from the dead, who was the first fruits of them that sleep, the Caraites, by saying that the sheaf should be waved on the first Sunday of that feast, identify this ceremony with the very day on which our Lord rose. The Rabbinical Jews (or Talmud) say that the word *Sabbath*, in the text, means the first day of unleavened bread; and from the second day of this feast, whatever day of the week it is, they begin to count the seven weeks. I strongly suspect that the Rabbinical Jews thus explain the word Sabbath, for the following reason: if the עֹמֶר, sheaf-offering, and the day of Pentecost occur, as they ought, on Sunday, it tends to confirm the remarkable events of the resurrection of our Lord, and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles, both of which events occurred upon Sundays. It is evident to me, from the propensity of the Talmudists to overthrow and subvert the word of God, that no credit can be given to their explanations, and that the Caraites are more to be depended on; and that the former not only observe the day of Pentecost out of its season, but even on a different day from what God had appointed.

The Talmudists are also guilty of another perversion, in respect to the feast of Pentecost, by setting aside its primary signification, as mentioned in Lev. 23: 15—22, and, by a fancy of their own, annexing to it a commemoration of the giving of the law on Mount Sinai, to which the command of Scripture makes not the slightest allusion, while their prayers and ceremonies upon this occasion are made to refer to their own invention, rather than to what God has

commanded. The following ceremony will illustrate this fact. They have a volume of considerable size, composed of extracts from the written and oral law, and the Zohar, called תִּקּוּן שָׁבוּעוֹת, indicating that all was given by God, from Sinai, which they require to be read through during the single night of the above feast, and which, as it generally occurs in the beginning of June, is no easy matter, notwithstanding that it is mumbled over with such rapidity, that the audience can scarcely recognise what language they are hearing. But to encourage the assembly to persevere in their task, each synagogue is furnished from the public treasury with an abundance of beer, and every one is permitted to drink of it as freely as he pleases, which never fails to produce many flushed countenances, drowsy readers, and burned books. When the morning arrives, at the hour of prayer, the aspect of the congregation would strike a spectator with surprise; for he would behold some fast asleep in the corners of the synagogue, and wrapped in their טליתים, or veils, others dozing, and the chanter reciting his prayers wholly regardless of the scene behind him, while his performance has no other effect than to lull the half-sleeping into a sound repose.

The next in order is *the feast of Trumpets*, mentioned in Num. 29: 1, and Lev. 23: 24; but it is no longer called by the Talmudists that of trumpets, but ראש השנה, the beginning of a new year, which is directly at variance with Ex. 12: 2. Nothing could have led them to this change, but the desire to annul the Scriptures, and substitute their own authority. To establish their ordinance, in reference to this feast, they affirm positively, that the Lord assigns to every creature on this day his destiny for the ensuing year. And although the reasons given in Scripture for blowing the trumpet are obvious,* they have hesitated not to substitute others of their own invention, which are now more current and popular, than that which the Lord has assigned. The following is assigned in the Talmud.† The trumpet is blown for the purpose of frightening and puzzling Satan, and making him unfit to bring accusations before the Lord against man-

* Turn to Numbers x. 10.

† The assertion is found in the Gamarah ראש השנה in the first section.

kind, whose destinies are this day determined, as they say. On this account they prohibit confession of sin on this day, lest Satan should overhear them, and multiply his accusations in consequence. This is more like a heathen superstition than any thing else.

The Mohammedans have a similar practice during their pilgrimage to Mecca, when they throw stones upon Satan to frighten and drive him from their presence. Most of the congregations know of no other reason for blowing the trumpets than that which I have mentioned. Another superstition is recommended and practised on this day, equally ridiculous. It is called תַּשְׁלִיךְ, from the root שלך, in Hiph. to throw or cast away. It is performed in the following manner. The whole congregation, men, women and children, repair to a river, or pond, or well, and offer a prayer at the brink, which is also called תשליך. After this each one shakes the skirts of his garments over the water, and they are taught to believe that by this act their sins are cast into the water, to support which they cite Micah 7: 19. Oh! poor, poor people! when will they come to that fountain of water which is opened to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and uncleanness?

On the previous month called אלול, Elul, which is the last month of the year, preparations are made for awakening their minds for this *supposed* day of judgment, when their destinies are to be allotted to them. To effect this, they resort to two practices. The first is to commence blowing with a horn every morning after prayer, from the first of the above month until the supposed new year, which is thirty days. This is taken from Amos 3: 6: "Shall a trumpet be blown in the city and the people not be afraid?" The second commences towards the latter part of the same month. They rise very early, some hours before day, to make confession of sins and to listen to the reading of poetry called סליחות slikhooth, which is adapted to produce a strong effect. If, however, on account of the difficulty of understanding it, the poetry fails to awaken the feelings, the tragical tones of the chanter make up the deficiency. Thus the whole congregation are deeply affected, especially the females, whose cheeks are bathed with a continuous flow of tears. And though during the attendance of the latter at the synagogue in the former part of the year, they talked of nothing but

their housekeeping, etc., yet as soon as these sounds reach their ears, nothing is heard from the women's apartment, which is separated by a wall from that of the men, but sighing, and weeping, and lamentable cries, which continue for hours together. Many of the congregation fast during the whole of this month, and give much alms; and during the space of six weeks, that is, from the beginning of this month till the setting in of the feast of Tabernacles, which are called fearful days, יָמִים נוֹרָאִים, the number of beggars is very great. They leave their homes on purpose to avail themselves of this favorable opportunity, and disappear as soon as it has ended. Most of them obtain sufficient during this period to support themselves and their families a whole year. Beside fasting and alms-giving, they pray to the dead to intercede for them, especially to their deceased relatives, and if they are separated by distance from the graves of these, they spare no pains to reach them. Distance presents no obstacle to the rich, neither poverty to the poor. Journeys of hundreds of miles are undertaken by myriads of both sexes for this purpose, while those who dwell near their graves not only invoke the spirits of the departed once, but every day, until the day of atonement has passed. This practice is known by the name of קִבְרֵי אבות, visiting the graves of (their) fathers. In passing the smallest cemetery in Poland or Russia, where Jews are residing, one may behold a promiscuous company of both sexes and of every age, prostrated upon the graves, and offering prayers to their mouldering relatives, in most lamentable strains. The Jews of the East carry this practice to greater excess than those of the West, having numerous saints to whom they pray, reckoning each person whose name is mentioned in the Talmud as such, and whose countless graves are scattered over the countries of Palestine and Babylonia. In order not to give offence to the deceased by omitting to address them as they would have been addressed if they were alive, an especial liturgy has been composed which is appropriate to the various relations of life, such as Rabbies, Saints, Martyrs, Schoolmasters, Husbands, Wives, Fathers, Mothers, Children, Brothers, Sisters, etc. etc. This liturgy is rather bulky, containing from 400 to 500 pages, and is called מִנְהָג לְשׁוֹן. This superstition is recommended or rather commanded by the Talmud in the following words—לְמַה יוֹצִיאִין לְבֵית הַקְּבָרוֹת חַד—

אביר וכ' וחד אמר, "Wherefore do they go upon the burial ground, etc." i. e. at the days of feasting? One said that כדי שיבקשו המתים רחמים עלינו, "the dead should pray for us." Gamarah Thanith, page 16, תענית.

After the feast of Rash Hashanna, ראש השנה, or Trumpets, is over, the days of repentance set in, called ימי התשובה, during which the Lord waits for them to repent, and the dooms which have already been determined and written down in their respective books, during the above feast, ראש הַשָּׁנָה, may yet be obliterated until the close of the day of atonement, when the Talmudists declare repentance is no longer of any avail. During these few specified days only, have they any hope of being reconciled to God, and the means which are used to reverse their doom are Fasting, צום, Alms, מיזן, and Prayers, קיל. But as soon as the dooms are sealed as well as written, the former of which does not take place until towards sunset on the day of atonement, all farther penances are ineffectual. The form of prayer then used at sunset, is called נעילה, which means shutting or bolting a door, indicating that the door is shut in reference to the reversal of their dooms, and no earthly thing can avail them. And they therefore make use of the words כתבינו לחיים: "Write us unto life," in the prayers of Rash Hashanna, and the words וחתמינו לחיים, "Seal us unto life," in the prayer נְעִילָה. The evils resulting from these doctrines are incalculable. It is true that the most of the Jewish community are greatly awakened by these pious frauds, and in their delusion they try to do all which is recommended or imposed by the Talmud, whether it be in accordance with the word of God, or contrary to it. Yet the consequences are bad in the highest degree, for as soon as they have passed safely through this short season of fear and trembling, they return with greater avidity to their former carelessness and security; according to the words of king Solomon, they return to their vomit. No other impression is made upon their minds, after these "fearful days," than the belief that their doom is fixed, and that during the remainder of the year no conduct, either good or bad, will affect it. The solemnity of their countenances vanishes, and their devotions and whole deportment become the same as before, until the trumpet of another year arouses them again.

On the day previous to *the day of atonement*, the cere-

mony of כפרות, or atoning sacrifices, takes place. I shall endeavor to describe this performance, and the directions of the ritual concerning it, and leave each one to form his own judgment respecting it.

Very early in the morning, an hour or two before sunrise, it commences. The ransoms, כפרות, are provided some time before, which are generally poultry, a cock for a male and a hen for a female; these are white, in allusion to the language of the prophet Isaiah, "Though your sins be as scarlet they shall become white as snow," etc. A pregnant female takes three, two hens and one cock, one hen for herself, and the others—

The head of a family performs the ceremony first for himself, and then for his household, by reading a form of prayer for those who cannot themselves read, but who are required to repeat it after him, word by word. For the young he performs the whole. The law, and its meaning, are given in the Ritual as follows:

לעולם יסבב בתחילה לעצמו קודם שיסבב לבני ביתו כדשרבוא זכאי ויכפר על החייב ולא החייב על החייב וכן הוא אומר וכפר בעדו ובעד ביתו:

The head of a family ought always to perform this ceremony ("the turning round," as the Hebrew terms it,) first for himself, that he may first become guiltless, and thus prepared to atone for those who are yet in their guilt, but not the guilty for the guilty, for it is said, in Lev. 16: 6, that he shall "make an atonement for himself and (then) for his house."

The prayer for the occasion begins as follows:

לשם יחוד קדוש ברוך הוא ושכינתיה בדחילו ורחימו ליחד שם י׳ה בו׳ה תנח אנוכי בא לעשות כפרה זו לתקן את שרשה במקום התליון וכ׳:

"In the name of the holy and blessed, in union with the Shekina, the terrible and the merciful, to unite the name of י׳ה to ו׳ה *Ye He* to *Vav He*, etc. I come to make this atonement, to establish its foundation in the most high place," etc. The rest is too cabalistic to be translated into English. When this prayer is finished, they take the כפרה, ransom in their right hand, and turning it nine times around their head, repeat the following words three times:

זה כפרתו זה חליפתי זה תמורתי זה תרנגול (לזכר) זאת תרנגולת (לנקבה) ילך אני תלך למיתה ואני אלך לחיים טובים:

"This is my reason, this is my compensation, this is my exchange; this cock (or this hen) shall depart to die, and I to a good life." Then each takes hold of the throat of his

ransom, which represents death by חנק, strangulation, and thus throws it down, and this represents death by סקילה, stoning; then the butcher immediately takes them and cuts their throats, which represents death by הרג, decapitation. All this is to show that if they have themselves deserved death in either of these ways, the condemnation is transferred to the ransom, and they are liberated. The intestines of the fowls must be thrown into some place, where they will moulder away, and not be touched by carnivorous animals, and the house-top is usually chosen. After the morning prayer, all repair to the burial ground, and there pay the value of the כפרות, ransoms, called פדיון כפרות, the redemption of the ransoms. After paying the value to the public treasurers, who they find in waiting, they are served with a good draught of brandy and a sweet cake, of which articles the treasurers have an abundant supply. They then address the deceased in general, and spend some time in passing from one class of graves to another, to invoke them all as common intercessors for the ensuing day, and they continue praying and weeping until hunger and fatigue remind them to return; and as they leave the burial ground the draughts are repeated. The Talmudists impose it as a duty upon all to eat and drink on this day, which they say the Lord will accept as readily as a fast:

ועניתם את נפשותיכם בתשעה לחודש וכי בתשעה מתענין והלא בעשור מתענין אלא לאמור לך כל האוכל ושותה בתשעה מעלה עליו הכתוב כאלו התענה תשיעי ועשירי:

"And ye shall afflict your souls in the ninth day of the month." Lev. 23: 32. Ought we then to fast on the ninth day? On the tenth we are commanded to fast, Lev. 23: 27; but we are taught by it that whoever eateth and drinketh on the ninth is as acceptable as if he had fasted on the ninth and the tenth." Gammarah Yooma, page 81. If the Talmudists had taken the latter clause "at even, from even unto even," etc., in conjunction with the first, which they took as their text, they would not have missed the true meaning of that passage, except from a desire to subvert the word of God, and to accumulate meritorious acts which are highly pleasing to the flesh. This command they execute with all possible strictness, and the following blessing is used at the meals:

לשם יחוד קדוש בריך הוא ושכינתיה בדחילו ורחימו ליחד שם י׳ה בוה הנה אנוכי בא לקיים מצות אכילה ושתיה חום הזה וכ׳:

"In the name of the holy and blessed, in union with the Shekinah, etc., I come this day to fulfil the command of eating and drinking," etc. The dainties prepared for the occasion are from the בפרוה, ransoms.

About 4 o'clock P. M. all repair to the synagogue, when each one who is above the age of twenty, prostrates himself upon the ground, and another inflicts upon him forty stripes save one, with a slight leathern strap, which produces no pain, and of course it is only an outward ceremony.* When this is over, they pray and confess their sins, by repeating a printed catalogue in Hebrew, which embraces every sin of which a man *can* be guilty. A very limited number only understand what they are about, and the rest know nothing. After this they return home and eat the last meal of the day, which must be done at sunset. The latter thanksgiving, that is, that which is said after meals, is repeated with showers of tears. Every grown up man dresses himself in the garment in which he is to be interred, all of white, which gives him a frightful appearance. All in the dwelling are struck with awe and consternation, and nothing is heard but sobbing. The young are obliged to go to their parents to ask from them a blessing, which is done by placing their hands upon the heads of the children, and the blessing runs down with floods of tears. Each one in the house is required to be reconciled with those whom he has offended, which is done in the most affecting manner, after which they resort to the synagogue, with an appearance of trembling and fear, as if they were going before the tribunal of Jehovah. The service begins with an absolution from all vows, bonds, oaths, etc., not only for the past year, but for the future year. It is an annulment only of those bonds, oaths, etc., which were made to God. It is done as follows. Three Rabbies, who are the בית דין, Baith Din, the judges of the congregation, go into the pulpit and take their place by the side of the chanter, and repeat to him the following words: בישיבה של מעלה ובישיבה של מטה על דעת המקום ברוך הוא ועל דעת הקהל הקדש הזה אנו מתירין להתפלל את העבריינין:

"Through the session above," (i. e. heaven,) "and through

* Known by the name of מלקות.

the session beneath" (i. e. the judges), "and through the approbation of the blessed God, and through the approbation of this holy congregation, we set at liberty the transgressors" (i. e. those who have not paid their vows, &c.) "to pray." Then the chanter repeats with a very loud voice, and melancholy tone, the following absolution:

כל נדרי ואסרי ושבועי ונידויוחרמי וקנמי וקינחי וקנסי די נדרנא ודי אשתבענא ידי חרמנא ודי אסרנא על נפשתנא מיום הכפורים שעבר עד יום הכפורים הזה שבא עלינו לשלום ומיום הכפורים הזה עד יום הכפורים שיבוא עלינו לשלום נדרנא לא נדרי ושבועינא לא שבועי וחרמנא לא חרמי ואסרנאלא אסרי כולהון אתחרטנא בהון יהיא רעוא די יהון שביתין ושביקין לא מריריז ולא קיימין (ויונין הקהל) שלשה פעמים) ונסלח לכל עדת בני ישראל ולגר הגר בתוכם כיכלל העם בשגגא.

"All vows, bonds, oaths, consecrations, anathemas, etc., which we vowed, and which we sware, and which we consecrated, and to which we bound ourselves from the day of atonement of the last year to the day of atonement of this year, which has come to us in peace; and from the present day of atonement to the day of atonement which shall come to us in peace, our vows shall be no vows, our oaths shall be no oaths, our anathemas shall be no anathemas, and our bonds shall be no bonds. We repent of all of them, and desire that they should be removed, and left to have no dominion and no existence." The chanter repeats this form of absolution three times, which the congregation answer three times in the following words, from Num. 15: 26: "And it shall be forgiven all the congregation of the children of Israel, and the stranger that sojourneth among them, seeing all the people were in ignorance." This absolution, I think, is not only preposterous, and contrary to Lev. 27th, Num. 30th, Ps. 15: 4, Deut. 23: 22, 23 and 24, and Eccles, 5: 4, but it has, also, a very evil influence upon their moral character. The evening prayer continues till about ten o'clock, and most of the congregation immediately after disperse, though some remain praying the whole night. The service of the day begins very early in the following morning, and continues until evening. The most of the day is spent by the chanters in rehearsing the prayers and poetry said by the congregation, which are protracted in chanting. The strangest part of the service is the imitation of the Temple worship, which is called עבודה, Aboudah, when the chanter, with his train of coadjutors, is obliged to strain every

nerve to render it romantic and expressive. To effect this, theatrical tunes and airs, borrowed from musical bands, are employed upon the occasion, appropriate to the respective pieces of tragical poetry, which are scarcely understood even by the best Hebrew scholars, being composed of Hebrew, Arabic and Chaldaic. This part of the service continues from four to six hours. Large sums of money are paid to good chanters on these occasions ; and those who undertake the business are obliged to confine themselves to a particular diet for six weeks previous. The chanter is called שליח ציבור, the messenger or representative of the congregation to implore and intercede with Jehovah for them. Every town, however small, has a שליח ציבור, or חזן, which is the same. He is supported by the public from year to year. It might be expected that if the chanters are in the place of intercessors, individuals would be selected who are approved by God and man ; but it will excite no surprise when I say, that such are not at all sought after. A fine and sweet voice is the only requisite, and this may just as well be accompanied by immorality and profligacy. This is particularly the case in large towns, where they are very eager to obtain a good chanter. He chooses the place which will furnish the highest salary. The chanters usually receive more than they can honestly spend, and the surplus they employ in the most iniquitous manner. One cause of their immorality arises from their being uneducated men, who from childhood have pursued this profession, travelling from place to place with those of the same occupation, whose training had been of the same kind. In my adopted native place, Bausky, in Cunland, where the Jews are not numerous, but rich, a chanter was obtained from Brody, a great distance, at an immense expense, on account of his deep and beautiful voice. They offered him a much larger salary than the people from whence he came could afford to give. His surplus funds being considerable, he pursued the usual profligate course of the profession. He would spend the whole week at a billiard house, only leaving it after sunset on Friday, when he ought to be in the synagogue to perform the Sabbath prayers. He also led astray several young men, who, through his advice, were led to the most atrocious acts. Nevertheless, he was allowed to be שליח ציבור, intercessor for the congregation; and when I

left my native place, he had occupied his station for about twenty years. Though old, he still continued his profligate course; and when performing the prayers, at the above festivals, (i. e. of the New-Year and Atonement,) he would display the powers of his voice by feigning to weep, the effect of which was so powerful as to bring tears from every eye beside. As his face was turned to the wall, which prevented his seeing what was going forward in the assembly, he would inquire of his coadjutors, in the middle of his chant, "*if the mob were howling*," and when answered in the affirmative, he would begin to mock them. And, although the whole congregation knew of his profligacy, hypocrisy, and mockery, they put great confidence in his prayers, because of his fine voice. This evil, as I have before remarked, is particularly incident to large and wealthy towns. This abominable system is introduced through the perversions made by the Talmud, of Prov. 3: 9: "Honor the Lord with thy *substance*," מיהונך, which the Talmudists say should be read, מגרונך, *thy throat*, i. e. by chanting and singing the prayers. The synagogue services, during the performances of the chanter, now that I have become acquainted with the purity and decency of Christian worship, seem to me like *stage playing*, and these שליח ציבור, representatives of the congregation, like abominable *stage actors*. I may venture to say that nearly all the chanters of large places in Poland, Russia, and Prussia, are licentious infidels, or, at least, exceedingly careless in regard to morality. When my countryman, Aaron, and myself were travelling through Prussia, we were eye-witnesses of the excessive profligacy of the chanters, which decency forbids me to relate.

The prayers of the New-Year and of the Atonement, are generally disturbed by the boisterous clamor of the women, all of whom, with very few exceptions, are ignorant in the extreme. During the whole year they have no desire to pray, or even to know what prayers are offered in the men's apartment of the synagogue, except on the above-mentioned feasts, when their destiny being, as they suppose, assigned to them, they feel ashamed to remain wholly indifferent. They accordingly hire teachers from among the men to read and translate the prayers on these occasions, but it being a great reproach to assume this mean office, they cannot obtain a sufficient number for their purpose. Conse-

quently when one enters their apartment to read and translate for them, he is surrounded by hundreds of women, all striving to get near enough to hear him, and in the crowd thus pressing upon him, he is driven backward and forward, until he fortunately finds refuge in a corner. Sometimes the translator takes with him a *tub*, in which he places himself, and thus is enabled to read unmolested. But the crowd of ignorant women is always so unmanageable and boisterous, that the translator can scarcely be heard, and in making an effort for this, he raises his voice until he becomes hoarse, when he leaves his audience for the men's synagogue. As soon as he departs, the noise of the women increases to such a degree as to disturb and confuse the services of the men, which makes it necessary for the managers of the latter assembly to go in among the women and restore order, which if they cannot accomplish, they are driven into a remote corner of the building, or put out of it altogether. This evil originates from the strong prohibitions against female education, which are found in the Talmud.

After the above form of prayer which is called עבודה or מוסף is over, the prayer of מנחה comes. This is repeated by any person, without being chanted, while the chanter and his coadjutors rest, to be prepared for the next task, which is called נעילה, the import of which has already been explained under the feast of the New-Year, when the same farce is renewed by the chanter, and continues for two or three hours. This prayer is usually finished about half an hour or an hour after sunset. Then follows the מעריב or evening prayer, which closes the duties of the day. Then each one lights a candle from the tapers which have been burning during the day, and when they reach home they pronounce a blessing over it. Previous to their return to their homes, however, they are obliged to assemble at the outer enclosure of the synagogue, where they pray, or bless the moon, and then they go home and take their meals, after having fasted from 26 to 27 hours, and being much exhausted with the laborious services of the day, which require the perusal during that period of a thick volume of poetry written in Hebrew, Arabic, and Chaldaic, which is scarcely understood even by the most learned among them.

The next morning they rise very early and repair again to the synagogue, and after their return home commence

erecting booths for the feast of Tabernacles. The reason given for this is, that Satan may not be able to accuse them before God, by saying that their devotion and early rising during the former days were only to obtain a good destiny, and that having secured this they had relapsed into their former carelessness. This however is but for one day, for on the second after the atonement they resume their old habits.

[*To be continued.*]

ARTICLE IX.

Some of the Characteristics of the Present Age.*

There has been a strong tendency, in certain periods of the Christian church, and in some individuals in all periods, to live in the Past. The life of such persons is made up of

---

* This article is the commencement of a series of Essays, in which the writer proposes to present a view of the ecclesiastical and religious state of England and Scotland, the political position of the Dissenters, the state of Biblical literature, and of Mental Philosophy in those countries, with some of the great questions which now agitate their ecclesiastical and political bodies. After which it is hoped that Germany and our own country will be brought under review. The writer possesses ample materials for this proposed survey of the characteristics of different countries, and his name, if given, would be a sufficient guarantee of the ability and discretion of his proposed discussions. But he earnestly requests that this series may appear *sine nomine*. His reasons are, that he will probably have occasion to speak somewhat plainly of living persons, current publications, etc. in Europe, and also of some things in our own country; and he will write anonymously with more freedom than he could do over his proper signature. As the field of these discussions will be somewhat peculiar, we trust the readers of the Repository will excuse us for yielding to the above request, while our knowledge of the writer assures us that he will not abuse his anonymous privilege.

Editor.

reminiscences. They read the page of history for its own sake; not as furnishing lessons of wisdom for the present or for the future. Their delight is among the tombs. The records of antiquity are all in illuminated letters. Their memory, like that of the very aged, extends far back, heedless of recent events. Their feelings kindle in the recollection of primitive, rather than in the anticipation of millennial piety. The present is loathed as a degenerate age, and its names are cast out as evil.

There are others who cling to the present. Instead of answering to the definition of beings who "look before and after," they do neither; they look only around. They cleave tenaciously to the existing and to the tangible. The page of history is a universal blank. The present fills the whole field of vision. Engrossed by the mighty changes which are going on before their eyes, they have no time to listen to the still voice which comes to them from past or future ages. Bustle, activity, energy, instant, practical effect, are their watchwords.

A third class are the children of hope and of desire. They live in a world of their own. Having no sympathy with the dull realities of the present, they are looking forward for some unattained, and, perhaps, unattainable good. They have conceived, it may be, exaggerated notions of the glory of the latter day. They have formed the figment of a millenium, not the rational one of the Scriptures, but one utterly inconsistent with the imperfection and probation of man.

But neither of these exclusive habits is desirable. They generally have their ground in misinformation, prejudice, or ignorance. When they do not proceed from either of these, but are to be regarded as a constitutional tendency of the soul, they are inordinately cherished, and render the subject unhappy or less useful, and his character inconsistent, or incomplete. In our feeble manner, so far as our powers and our knowledge permit, we are to be like Him who is incapable of prejudice, who looks upon all things justly, and according to truth.

We are not called upon to fix an idolatrous attachment on any of the great names in church history, nor to be reluctant to have their merits canvassed with discriminating candor, even at the risk of the loss of some of our complacency

and reverence. It is not our duty to picture to ourselves a golden age of piety in the past, and long for the coming of some other such. That golden age never existed, or if it did exist, it may never come again. The developments of Christianity, in primitive times, were, in many respects, peculiar. The religion was in its infancy, in an empire that overshadowed the civilized world. It was before the invention of printing, before the division of the Christian disciples into sects, and before the formation of systems of divinity. The religion was put to the test too. The stuff of which it was made was ascertained between the teeth of the Numidian lion, in the tarred coat, and under the lictor's axe. Piety, in all its circumstances, like that of the converts of John and of Polycarp, will never be seen again on earth. Christianity, while she maintains her essential elements, must adapt herself to the changing forms of the church and of the world. It is in vain to lament that ours is not the primitive style. To believe, to love, and to suffer like them, we must be thrown back eighteen hundred years, and be set down under the shadow of a pagan throne, in an upper chamber, where a few hundred artless men and women were assembled. We must, also, have in our hearts that peculiar love to the Saviour, which sprung up in part within their bosoms, from knowing how he looked, how he walked, how he spoke, what were the cadences of his voice. It was, also, in part, the product of the experience of common dangers and sufferings.

On the other hand, we have no cause unduly to magnify the present, as if our generation were the people, and as if wisdom were to die with them. One draws heart and life from the past. It is a barbarian spirit that would drag down into the dust the great names which brighten along the tract of church history. It is a refreshment to the spirit to think how they loved, and believed, and wrote, and preached. Some of them lived when primitive, or protestant Christianity was passing through its agonies of trial:

> ——Strenuous champions—
> ——Who, constrained to wield the sword
> Of disputation, shrunk not, though assailed
> With hostile din, and combating in sight
> Of angry umpires, partial and unjust;
> And did, thereafter, bathe their hands in fire,
> So to declare the conscience satisfied:

Nor for their bodies would accept release,
But blessing God, and praising him, bequeathed,
With their last breath, from out the smouldering flame,
The faith which they by diligence had earned,
And through illuminating grace received,
For their dear countrymen, and all mankind.

He who lives only in the present, voluntarily excludes himself from the influences which would be of most essential service to him. He consents to be a creature of the moment, a child of sense, and to walk by the light of his own little rush.

Equally unwise is it to shut out the future. There are generous hopes and noble aspirations in which we may lawfully indulge. The kingdoms of nature, of Providence, and of grace, are governed by uniform laws; and by watching their development, we may predict, with some confidence, the things which shall be. We know, too, from Revelation, that better days are coming; and, though we cannot determine the exact time, nor the amount of blessings in store for our race, nor many of the attendant circumstances, yet we may take the consolation of their certain and benign approach. Besides, we are as much creatures of imagination as we are of sense and of memory. We have as much right to indulge in the first as we have in the others. Looking entirely on the past, we acquire a melancholy, if not a narrow and bigoted mind. Confined to the present, we are shallow, and self-conceited, and boastful. Living wholly in the future, we become unsubstantial enthusiasts.

Many of the imperfections in the characters of individuals, and many of the evils which befall political communities, as well as the church of Christ, may be traced to one of these three great tendencies—a predominant love for the Past—an exclusive attachment to the Present, or an ardent desire for future good, imaginary or real. It is memory, sense, imagination. It is veneration amounting to idolatry for bygone times; it is an absorption in what is visible and apparent; or it is an insane reaching forward for those things which never can exist, or which "the Father hath put in his own power." Hence it is important, when we attempt to estimate the character of an individual, of a nation, or of an age, that we understand what are the main influences which have conspired to form that character; from what direction

they proceed, and how they combine to form one result. The writer of the Oxford Tract worships the dusty centuries which are gone. The radical tramples the Past indignantly into the mire. The poet of hope, and also the political perfectionist, expect to realize on earth an Elysium of all conceivable good. The Scotchman fights for every old corner and every crumbling pillar. The Frenchman falls down before the feverish Present. The German reigns over the empire of the air, and lets the weeds grow on the graves of the most honored names in his history. The middle ages garnished the sepulchres of Thomas Aquinas and the schoolmen. Henry More, Cudworth, and their contemporaries in England, bowed, almost idolatrously, at the shrine of Plato.

What are the characteristics of our age? What are some of the prominent tendencies of the generation to which we belong? By what features is the nineteenth century distinguished?

Against the propriety of answering questions like these, two objections may be urged. It may be said, in the first place, that we are not in a condition to judge fairly. We are actors in the scenes which are passing before us. We are too much interested to form an accurate judgment. Time must set his seal before we can ascertain the truth. Besides, every thing appears confused, indefinite and complicated, an inextricable labyrinth of good and evil. It is as when we look on a picture from a wrong point of view. We cannot disentangle threads so involved. In the second place, it may be objected, that it is extremely hazardous to state an opinion on such subjects. The whole aspect of the world may be revolutionized by the events of a single year. Our profoundest reflections may turn out to be the merest guesses; our wisest decisions, the contingent and baseless visions of a night. Our most confident predictions may resemble the oracles of the modern prophets. Our rivals may be Matthias, Smith, and Miller.

In reply, we may say, that there are certain general tendencies, characteristics or facts, about which there need be no dispute. They are known and read of all men. Our duty is essentially connected with understanding them fully. We cannot accomplish the great object of our existence without knowing how to act upon our fellow-men, how to meet their prejudices—how to turn public opinion into the

right channels—how to shape our influence so as to produce the highest possible good. There is said to be in some statesmen an almost prophetic sagacity. Why may there not be in Christians a spiritual sagacity as keen?

Is it not possible, moreover, to consider this subject without degenerating into threadbare declamation, as though our age were the turning-point in the history of the race, or as though we had come to the grand crisis in the world's affairs. A sober view of the condition of things will show us, that it is a matter of no little moment to live at the present time. The imperfect conceptions even, which we may form on the aspects of the age, may not be without use.

1. An obvious tendency of the present age is towards an equalization of civil rights and privileges. This tendency has been very apparent ever since the Protestant Reformation. An immediate effect of that great event was to break down the unnatural distinctions which had grown into a compact form under the name of the feudal system. It was not the object of the reformers to teach men their political rights, but they did teach political rights most effectually. The obligation, which they so earnestly enjoined upon every man, that he should read the Bible for himself and obey its precepts, stamped at once a high value and dignity upon the human soul. That soul could no longer be trampled with impunity, under the iron heel of oppression. It was found to have been created for some other purpose than to buy an indulgence for sinning, or to contribute towards the erection of St. Peter's at Rome. One of the greatest benefits which the Reformation conferred on mankind, was the deep and ineffaceable impression which it made in the middle and north of Europe, that a man is *personally* rather than ecclesiastically, responsible for his actions to his fellow-men and to his God. Foreign custody of the conscience was of course broken up.

The settlement of the Northern Colonies in this country was another circumstance which contributed materially to the same result. In addition to the great features of a republican government which our fathers established, they adopted two usages, which were then hardly recognised in Europe, and which have exerted an immense and most happy influence—the abolition of the rights of primogeniture, and the conferring of absolute ownership in the soil. The inhe-

riting of the whole estate by the eldest son, and the exclusion of the occupants of the land from proprietorship in it, were customs fraught with manifold evils. From these evils we have been, for the most part, exempt.* The consequence has been a greater diffusion of civil privileges, more independence of character, a deeper sense of the importance of personal effort, less of a servility and a cringing meanness on the one hand, and of idleness, dissipation, and an overbearing haughtiness on the other.

An additional fact in proof of our general position, is the gradual introduction of representative and constitutional features into the governments of some of the countries of central and of northern Europe. In 1834, a representative chamber was created in Denmark. In Norway, a representative assembly meets triennially, by its own right, reviews all pay and pension lists, all political and civil appointments, and whose decisions become law, without reference to the will of the executive, after having been adopted at three successive sessions. The despotic king of Prussia is wise enough to adopt, gradually, some salutary changes.† Six of the German states have constitutional forms of government. Greece, and even Spain and Portugal, after ages of slavery and oppression, are going through the difficult ordeal of learning how to govern themselves. We need hardly allude, in this place, to the influence of the French revolution, which, with its unutterable evils, greatly abridged the temporal power of the Pope, and did much to break down the feudal system.

The efforts for the abolition of the slave trade and of slavery, are tending to the same result. The abolition of West Indian bondage, by England, with its accompanying exertions for the moral improvement of the emancipated, was not a levelling and radical measure. It was equalizing the condition of men, by raising up, not by throwing down. It was a noble republication of God's truth, that He has made of

---

* What the mischief might have amounted to if these customs had been fully transplanted to this country, may be inferred from the late unhappy disturbance among the tenants of the Patroon of Albany.

† See several passages in the Travels in England of Prof. Von Reaumer.

one blood all the nations of men on all the face of the earth. It was one of those great steps which are taken in the progress of centuries towards the final redemption of our race.

Equally to our purpose is the temperance reformation. Intemperance creates a worse than feudal system. It is the slavish subjection of the many to the few. It binds the great mass, body, soul, estate, time, talents, every thing, in bonds of steel, to the oligarchy of a few rum-sellers and wholesale dealers. It raises up its huge baronial distilleries, where all the neighboring vassals must repair, at certain intervals, to do homage, or else to do battle against all who would assault the strong-hold. Intemperance collects all the industry, purity, magnanimity, and rational equality of the neighborhood, and lays them down as a holocaust at the door of some titled dispenser of the poison. On the other hand, the temperance reform is scattering these ill-gotten piles. Its tendency is to distribute competence at every man's door. It is most beneficently equalizing the gains of lawful business.

We are not, however, to infer that this tendency is yet fully developed. The great task of the present age in Europe, it has been asserted, is to overthrow the feudal system; an arrangement, or disarrangement in society, which grew out of times of barbarism and confusion, and which is not only inconvenient and useless, but is directly at variance with the progress of society, and the well-being of man. We have, in our country, one scion from this accursed root—the practice of duelling. In accordance with this usage, honorable men set themselves above the laws, on the ground that laws were made, not for honorable men, but for the vulgar multitude, whose perceptions are not delicate enough to understand the nice distinctions by which honorable murderers are governed. Unhappily, there does not seem to be force enough in our laws to reach these high-minded transgressors. Inequality of position makes an inequality of punishment. The poor manslayer must perish on the scaffold, while the honorable murderer walks fearlessly at large, and with hands crimsoned with a brother's blood, continues to make laws for the people.

Nowhere is this miserable inequality more visible than in

Pagan and Mohammedan countries. All Western, Central and Eastern Asia, is a horrible tyranny of the few over the many. Desolation reigns in the finest countries of the globe, because of the iron-handed tyranny of a few despots, and of their subordinate minions. Half a dozen individuals grow rich on the hard-earned pittance of millions. No essential melioration can be expected while this state of things continues. The soul of the Pagan may be saved, but he can never come into the enjoyment of the blessings of civilization. Industry, trade, commerce, science, are out of the question. Every feeling of independence is crushed in the germ.*

The great doctrines of legal and of equitable freedom are, therefore, to be carried throughout the world, not simply till the children of Africa, or the degraded of any other clime, shall be raised up from their debasement, but till all men shall perfectly understand and enjoy, unmolested, their rights.

Yet, while this great tendency of the age towards an equalization of rights is to be encouraged, it still must have limits and qualifications. Checks and guards must be thrown around it, or it will degenerate into a rank democracy in church and state, or into a pestilent radicalism.

In the first place, this equalization of rights is to be accomplished by elevating the degraded, instructing the ignorant, and reclaiming the vicious, rather than by a system of levelling, or by a moral decapitation. It is true, undoubtedly, that in the progress of this great change, the men who have reached their distinctions by fraud and violence, will be shorn of their honors. But this will rather be the necessary result than the direct object. The grand intention should be to raise all men to the highest degree of virtue of which their nature is susceptible, and to impart all that intellectual knowledge which circumstances will permit.

In the second place, this equalization of rights is to be kept

---

* How the missionaries at the Sandwich Islands will overcome the difficulty arising from this source, it is not easy to see. Every foot of ground, every blade of grass is the property of the chiefs, and has been, from immemorial usage. Men must have a motive to work, or they cannot be civilized, or thoroughly Christianized.

entirely distinct from the pernicious doctrine of Rousseau, and his school. Men are not born in a state of nature, independent, isolated, with the option of entering or of not entering into a social state, as it may suit themselves, reserving certain rights, and resigning others for the general good. This state of nature never had existence except in Rousseau's brain. The social compact system has high sounding words, and nothing else. God has made man dependent and social. Man cannot but enter into society. The choice is not put into his power. The original, independent, abstract right of entering, or not entering, into a social state, is a mere figment. It never did exist, and never can. Men have indefeasible and inalienable rights, such as those of conscience, but these they hold *in* a social state, and not merely in an *ante*-social state, if such a condition of things were practicable.

This equality does not imply, in the third place, a community of goods. No theory can be wilder than that which would abolish the rights of private property. The sects that maintain this doctrine remain small, because they do maintain it. There is no reason to believe that in the purest state of society yet to be on earth, any such distribution of property would be possible or desirable. It would eradicate one of the strongest principles which God has fixed in the nature of man.

Again, this equality does not suppose that monarchical governments must be necessarily abolished. There is as much equality in regal Norway as in republican Switzerland. The people are better educated in despotic Prussia than in our own democratic Union. Our theory of government is, unquestionably, the most perfect, as a theory. It harmonizes better than any other with the personal agency, and indefinite, individual improvement of man. At all events, we should not wish to exchange it. Still, the exertions of the friends of human happiness ought not to be directed so much to the demolition of any theory of government, as to elevate the people, and prepare them to govern themselves. A frame of polity which is best fitted to one people, in one country, may not be best fitted to another people, on another continent and in another hemisphere. What could the Russian boor, in his smoky cabin, and in his sheepskin *kaross*, do with our elective franchise?

The doctrine in question does not imply, once more, that society will ever be reduced to a dead, undistinguishing level. Distinctions will always remain on earth, and in heaven too. One individual has an original tact for acquiring wealth, while his neighbor remains perfectly satisfied with small resources. Education, in the best possible state of society, can never be enjoyed by all equally. If practicable, it would not be expedient.

No perversion of the true doctrine of equality is more pernicious, and hardly any one is more common, than to flatter the *people*, as the original source of all power and right, or as uttering the voice of God. This common usage of politicians renders the people dissatisfied with their lot, and communicates the impression that *masses* of men have inherent virtue, and that they will provide well enough for themselves, if they but understand their rights. But the people are naturally frail, perverse, and wicked, like those who attempt to hoodwink them. Ignorance among the people is not the only cause of the wretchedness or the ruin of nations. The politicians, who thus beguile the multitude with fair speeches, are perfectly aware of the arts necessary for the accomplishment of their purposes.

2. The practical tendency of the age is very obvious. This is now as strikingly exhibited as its reverse was a few centuries since. *Then* speculation was widely predominant. A man was valued according to his ability to dispute on questions the most foreign to his daily business; or rather, his daily business was revery, or interminable logomachy, not on strictly metaphysical subjects, not on the soul and its faculties, but on airy nothings, and impalpable inanities. That this predominant tendency is now reversed may be owing, in part, to the extreme to which it was then carried. It is a reaction which has drawn the whole world after it. Men are now *realists* in another than the technical sense of the word. They have broken away, not only from the absurdities and follies of the middle ages, but they are in danger of trampling under foot what was truly excellent in former times.

The Reformation contributed largely to this practical tendency. Luther was engaged in a controversy not about words, but respecting *things*. In order to carry his points,

he was compelled to show the practical effects of his doctrines. He had no time for verbal subtleties. He was used to speak of Aristotle and the schoolmen with the utmost contempt. He translated the Bible into the vernacular speech, and composed hymns and catechisms for the common people and for children. He would have made no indifferent writer of tracts, or a lyceum lecturer of the present day. He discussed those subjects which took the deepest hold of the common mind. In order to give character and permanency to the Reformation, every thing was to be done, and that immediately.

To the same result, the labors of Bacon, Newton, Locke and Paley, and their numerous disciples in Great Britain and France have powerfully contributed. The great aim of Bacon's philosophy was practical. It was the multiplying of human enjoyments, and the mitigating of human sufferings. It was "dotare vitam humanam novis inventis et copiis." It was utility. He laments the propensity of mankind to employ, on mere matters of curiosity, powers, the whole exertion of which is required for purposes of solid advantage.* The practical influence of Locke's doctrines is known by all who speak the English tongue. Unlike Bacon's in some important particulars, yet in their practical tendency, they fell in with the great Chancellor's teachings and with the fundamental movement of the Reformation. "Locke," says Dr. Warton, "affected to depreciate the ancients." "This disrespect for the wisdom of antiquity," observes Dugald Stewart, "is a prejudice which has frequently given a wrong bias to his judgment." He seems, also, to have had little power of imagination or discrimination in taste, esteeming Sir Richard Blackmore as one of the first of English poets. The homely, hearty, practical sense, which pervades all Dr. Paley's works is universally acknowledged. Perhaps no writer in the language has exerted a wider influence in the actual business and over the practical judgments of men than Dr. Paley.†

---

* See the article on Lord Bacon, in the Edinburgh Review, No. 132.

† "The practical bent of his nature is visible in the language of his writings, which, on practical matters, is as precise as the nature of the subject requires, but, in his rare and reluc-

Intimately connected with these facts is the remarkable arrangement of Providence, that the great interests of civilization and of Christianity, should be committed, in so high a degree, to the countrymen of Bacon and of Locke. The men, who are imbued with their spirit, and who are familiar with their writings, have carried their influence into every region of the globe.

An additional and a powerfully coöperative cause is the modern revival of Christianity. The grace of God which was granted to the United Brethren, about one hundred years since, may be regarded as having set in motion these labors of love, unless our own Eliot and the Mayhews may be regarded as having the prior claim. Countless hosts, the noble and the good, the wise and the lowly, have trode in their footsteps, till beneficence, not good wishes, practical benefit, and not theoretical excellence, have become the glory of our age. Who can but rejoice that it is so? Who would bring back, if he could, the 10th century, or even the 17th? Who does not exult that the wretchedness of man has at last touched the heart of man? Who will not bless God that the disciples of Christ are willing to follow his sublime example, and *go about* doing good? The grand employment of Christendom is not hoarding, it is diffusion. Like the sunlight and the atmosphere, they are dispensing blessings over every region.

Do we ever repine that this is a practical age? Do we sigh because we were not born in the meditative days of Plato, when men speculated nobly, when the human mind received its last finish of elegance, but when deformed children were thrown out to the wolves of the mountains, when Athens, the eye of Greece, the intellectual metropolis of the world, contained twelve times as many slaves as freemen, when there was not a hospital in the known world? Do we sometimes fondly linger over the age of Queen Elizabeth, illuminated with a constellation of great men, the like of which the world had never seen? But what was the condition of the vast prostrate multitude? Under the auspices of that learned queen, with all her orators, scholars, statesmen, geniuses, it was not possible to find persons to supply

---

tant efforts to rise to first principles, becomes indeterminate and unsatisfactory." *Mackintosh.*

the churches generally, who could go through the service decently--a service made ready in every part to their hands--and when to be able to read was the very marked peculiarity of here and there an individual !* No ! we give thanks to God that this is a practical age. For its monuments we do not point to the temple of Minerva or Sunium, to the Egyptian obelisk, nor to St. Peter's at Rome, piled up to the sky in its glorious proportions and its dazzling brightness by the blood and groans of thousands of wretched men. We hope that the next age, and that all coming ages will be practical, till the world shall be renovated. Instead of lamenting that we are surrounded with men and women energetic in doing good, we have every reason to rejoice. He, who would change the character of the age, must arrest the progress of invention and discovery in the arts and sciences, must destroy the thousand agencies which are at work on land and sea, annihilating space and time ; he must stop the influence of the Reformation ; he must burn up the Novum Organum; he must obliterate from the minds of men the deeds of the greatest benefactors of the race, and disband our philanthropic efforts, and turn back those great wheels, which, at every revolution, are bringing happiness to man and glory to God.

Obvious evils, however, accompany this general tendency of the age. Men will rush from one absurdity to its opposite. It is contemplation so exclusive as to become morbid; or action so bustling as to be superficial and unproductive. We are not endued with muscular powers only. We have other organs besides that of the brain.

An exclusive practical habit promotes an unsettled, restless state of mind, unfits for calm meditation on truth, and tends to identify virtue with feeling, not with the feeling which is the natural product of reflection, but with that which is momentary, fitful, and occasioned by unworthy or insufficient causes. It teaches to keep the *conduct* with all diligence, because from the *actions* proceed the issues of life. It thus insensibly sets up a new standard of morality, instead of requiring a watch over the motives, in order that the fountain of moral influence may be kept pure. It teaches us to look at the outward conduct, and if that be

* See John Foster's Essay on Popular Ignorance.

salutary, we may conclude that we are on the high road to virtue and to heaven.

This exclusive regard for the practical, sometimes leads us to make false estimates of what is really useful. It regards nothing as valuable but what may be turned to instant good account. Unless one immediately produces dollars and cents, or at once clothes the naked, and feeds the hungry, or so preaches the gospel that every man on the spot forsakes his sins, the implication is that no good is done; it is concluded that there is a fatal defect in his labor, and the whole is thrown by as an empty theory, or a useless impertinence. But this practical man has yet to learn another lesson. He has yet to know that utility may be stamped on the most secret meditations of the soul, on those "inner circles of thought and feeling," into which none but itself and its God can enter. Yes, there are thoughts, reminiscences, hopes, aspirations, half-formed conceptions, hidden feelings, which may be as useful to the world as the most notorious and highly lauded works of mercy. They elevate the soul; they sustain it under depressions which no outward appliances could reach; they reveal its high origin and its glorious destiny. They fit it to bear and to suffer. It is after such visions on the mount that one is fitted to return and mix with the multitude at the foot, and attend to their necessities. He is as much a practical man who prays, as he who contributes; he who thinks, as he who acts; he who demonstrates a proposition, as he who constructs a compass; he who analyzes the atmosphere, as he who makes a wire-gauze; the preacher who medidates in his study, as the sacred orator whose words of fire kindle the passions of ten thousand great congregations. Howe's Blessedness of the Righteous, Butler's Analogy, Pascal's Thoughts, may have been as useful as the Rise and Progress. The effects in the former case are not so immediate, palpable, and notorious as they are in the latter. But Pascal, Butler, and Howe, feed the fires which warm and illuminate the world. A minister in his study, or in his solitary walks, may have thoughts upon God, upon eternity, upon the nature of his own soul, which he never presents to his people, which are, possibly, incapable of being fully expressed in language, but which may be as beneficial to his flock as the most elaborate sermons to which they ever listened. We have heard of

men who expressed the ardent wish that they had been the authors of some very useful tract, the Dairyman's Daughter, for example, which had been, apparently, the means of the conversion of thousands. Yet these very men, who thus regret their feebler influence, may reach to higher seats in heaven than the authors of this or of the other tract. The principal idea developed in the popular publication, may have been dug up from the deepest mine of truth, by some retired student in his closet, and he, in the sight of God, may have done more than his applauded neighbor to bless the world. We judge according to the outward appearance; God judgeth according to the truth. The brook, which runs under the grass, as if too modest to show its clear waters to the sun, may do as much good as the noisiest torrent.

Another evil of the tendency in question is seen in its effects on education. This is truly a simplifying, if it be not a simple age. The demand is, that every thing which is presented to the minds of children, should be excessively easy, so that, in effect, no application of mind is required, no vigorous attention, nothing which admits of doubt, leads to inquiry, suggests difficulties. It is asserted that children ought never to listen to that which they do not understand. A dialect must be invented for their special benefit. It has been even gravely proposed, that we should have children's meeting-houses, and children's sermons, and children's preachers. But all these fond fancies overlook a fixed law of Providence—self-education, the personal overcoming of difficulties—the iron industry, the unflinching resolution, the unrelaxed perseverance. Books need to be simplified just so far, and teachers supplied to just such an extent, as to induce the child, or the scholar, to make the most strenuous exertions himself. Any further simplification or provision is positively injurious.

The same tendency may be seen in creating a dislike to doctrinal preaching, and to systems of divinity. In this respect, it must be confessed, that there is some degeneracy in our age. In the 17th and 18th centuries the great truths of the gospel were understood and proclaimed, both in England and in this country, with singular earnestness, power, and solemnity. Our fathers were rooted and grounded in the faith. We recollect some venerable men

of the last generation, who have but just descended to the grave, who had the most intelligent conviction of the prominent truths of the Bible, and the warmest attachment to them. They used to speak of the conversions which occurred in their youthful days, as the result, so far as human agency was concerned, of long-continued, personal, solitary application to the truths of the gospel. With them, feeling flowed from contemplation. Anxiety of mind was caused by clear apprehensions of their duties towards God. They had but few books, and the large quarto Bible, with the *imprimatur* of Oxford, was the one great and inestimable treasure in every house. The books, (generally sermons or treatises on divinity,*) which they did possess, were thoroughly read and digested. Every leaf bore the marks—possibly caused by the fallen tear of some venerable octogenarian—of the earnest perusal, perhaps, of several successive generations. Our fathers listened, not merely without weariness, but with great delight, to the protracted three hours' service of the sanctuary, intending to carry away, not a momentary impression produced by an impassioned hortatory appeal, but the body of the long sermon, with its scores of heads and subdivisions.

It scarcely need be remarked how entirely diverse is the existing fashion. By a reaction from the old habit, by the stirring influence of our large cities, by the multiplication of practical duties on the Sabbath, and, in general, by the spirit of the times, we are in no little danger of becoming visionary, inconstant, superficial Christians, instead of being like the doctrinal, patient, thorough disciples of past generations. No reasonable man can object to the strong personal appeal, to the direct, pungent application which characterize many of the sermons of the present day; they are indispensable, and, not unfrequently, very effective. But it seems to be forgotten that the mind needs something more substantial; that in certain states it is satisfied with nothing except the clear delineation of such subjects as the eternity and immutability of God, and the glory of Christ, in what used to be called, significantly, his "office-work." An indirect exhibition

* Such as Boston's Fourfold State, the Berry-street Sermons, Stoddard's Safety of appearing in the Righteousness of Christ, Flavel's Touchstone, etc.

of such topics is, sometimes, practical preaching in the best sense.

3. General intelligence is a characteristic of the age. This proposition is obviously true. The deep intellectual interest awakened in some parts of the continent of Europe, in portions of the most despotic governments on the globe, and in the United States, is worthy of all commendation. Still, however, but little has been done except to reveal how much needs to be done. The benefits of knowledge are yet but partially enjoyed, even in some of the most highly civilized countries. The proportion of persons in France who can read and write, has been stated to be but thirty-eight in one hundred. In the county of Devon, England, it was found, two or three years since, that it was not the poor only who could not write, but one-fourth of the overseers of the poor were in the same singular predicament. In large parts of Buckinghamshire, only ten in one hundred of the adults can read, and but one person in ninety is able to write. Large districts in and around London are in this condition of semi-barbarism. Mr. W. C. Johnson, M. C. from Maryland, stated in his place in Congress, that one-third of the voters, who gave evidence in a contested election in North Carolina, were *marksmen*, i. e. men who made their mark. Mr. J. gave many other startling facts in proof of the great destitution, in respect to the simplest rudiments of education, in some of the oldest states.

It is worthy of particular inquiry, how far the education of the present day is under the control of Christian principles. It has been made a serious question, whether mere intellectual education exerts any restraining influence upon the bad passions of men The following facts have been adduced—how far conclusive, we do not pretend to decide—to show that it does exert some beneficial effect, at least for a time. Out of 4,222 criminals subjected to punishment in France, in the year 1833, all but 454 belonged to the classes either wholly without education, or who had received only the lowest degree of instruction. Out of fifty persons sentenced to death, not one belonged to the educated classes. From a population of more than thirty-two millions, only forty-nine well-educated persons were considered as deserving of punishments in any degree severe. The examples of ancient Greece

and Rome, it is said, are not in point to prove the contrary to that which the above facts imply, as immensely the largest part of the population of those countries were sunk in the most stupid ignorance.

Still, we are no believers in the efficacy of mere intellectual education. It may prevent, or diminish the more gross and notorious forms of depravity, but it cannot dry up the fountain, or put any effectual check on the streams. Possibly, some of the *well-educated* criminals in France were not arrested, or could not have been brought to trial, if they had been. One of the French literati, like Victor Hugo, the great novel writer, may have done more to corrupt the public mind than hundreds of the *canaille*, who throw themselves into the Seine, or who perish on the scaffold, merely because they but carry out the principles which some Hugo has seducingly recommended.

It is matter for devout acknowledgment, that the Bible is used, to such an extent in Germany, and to some degree in our Union, as an indispensable reading-book, or text-book, in the common schools; and that many parents who make no pretensions to religion, desire to have their children attend a school where religious instruction is communicated. Even the duellist finds consolation in the fact that his family will be sustained in the orphanage, which his own murderous hands have caused, by that religious education to which he proves utterly recreant.

The multiplication of books, at the present day, is regarded by many as a serious evil, not more on account of that class of these publications which is positively pernicious, than because of the uncounted number of the superficial, of the frivolous, or the transcript for the thousandth time. Yet it seems to be forgotten that the number of readers is wonderfully increased, and that the supply is no larger than the demand. The multiplication of books is a natural consequence of the increased diffusion of education, and of the religious and missionary spirit. In the complaints which are sometimes made on the character of the publications of the present day, full justice is not done to them. Many of the English authors of the 17th century are re-published, not for the purpose of augmenting a library, but to be read and digested. Still, the amount of publications, either positively injurious, or excessively shallow, is very great. A style of

composition is adopted which is at utter variance with all taste and sobriety, and which is fast corrupting the language. The records of Newgate, or the Tolbooth, are searched for terms, and the histories of Botany Bay for illustrations. The depth of debasement into which the popular press of France is sunk, almost defies belief. Hundreds of volumes are poured forth every year, the basis of which are the precious confessions of some condemned malefactor or scapegallows. The production is seasoned with wit, and made attractive by the most licentious language, closing with some diabolical catastrophe, where suicide, or adultery, or assassination, are made out to be virtues. This deluge of pernicious books, emanating from France, and spreading into Belgium, Switzerland, and Germany, is one of the crying enormities of the age.

A paramount and most solemn duty of the friends of Christ, in every civilized land, is to watch the press vigilantly, and make it what it ought to be. The amazing energies of this great engine are nowhere fully appreciated. A newspaper, like one or two in New-York, or London, or Paris, edited with great tact and talent, and going daily into ten thousand families, has a power of mischief which is unutterable. Nothing but omniscient foresight, and almighty power, can counteract an influence which is stamped and re-stamped every day in the year. It is this *unintermitted* action which renders the daily press so influential; which makes the worse appear the better reason; which transmutes vice into virtue; and, finally, peoples hell with its countless victims. Repeat a groundless and wicked story every day for a month, and you will at length be believed by sober, and Christian men too. The newspapers, and the literature of every land, should be pure, and be uniformly devoted to the well-being of man. Nothing can be more imperative upon intelligent Christians, than to uphold those works, and those men, that have this for their object. Laboring here, they labor in the very centre and focus of those means and influences which are to regenerate the world.

4. We will next remark upon the age as having an infidel tendency. The great cause of this tendency is the same in every period. Men do not like to retain God in their

knowledge, and he gives them up to a reprobate mind. It also seems to manifest itself in certain forms in all ages. If these forms do not appear for a time, they soon manifest themselves in some other part of the world.

One of the most common and plausible forms of skepticism is founded on the opinion that the world is in a perpetual change, while yet no progress is made. There is a constant flux and reflux; currents and counter-currents; alternate barbarism and civilization. While the light of freedom goes out on one shore, it is rekindled on another. When one continent has lost the energy of its civilization, and its general spirit languishes, another continent is discovered. When a high degree of refinement has brought along its corresponding vices and degeneracy, then there is a fresh awakening in the ancient seats of learning and civilization. Thus all things change, and yet all things remain as they were from the beginning. Though there may be, at the first view, some plausibility in this theory, yet it wholly overlooks or denies the predictions of the Bible, as well as a great body of facts which have occurred for the last three hundred years.

Another of the common phases of infidelity is pantheism.* By this is understood, according to the most learned doctors of the sect, an infinite substance, comprehending all matter and mind in itself, with the attributes of infinite thought and infinite extension. All that exists is only a necessary succession of modes of being in a substance for ever the same. In certain forms this doctrine has existed in all ages. It derives some countenance from a few popular modes of expression, and from the perversion of two or three passages of Scripture. It denies a personal God, who is independent of matter and of other beings, and who existed prior to matter and to all other beings. It of course destroys all accountability on the part of man, and renders a future judgment absurd. This is the atheism of philosophers and of reflecting men. If we are not much mistaken, there is no

* "Pantheism consists in this, that it considers the all of things, τὸ πάν, or the world in the widest sense, as God, and admits, in its fundamental notion, no other being as separate from him. Consequently it identifies God and the world."—Germ. Convers. Lexicon, Ed. 1837, viii. 259.

inconsiderable tendency to this species of infidelity in some of the most cultivated minds in our country.

Far more common is the doctrine held by some naturalists and physicians, that matter, or corporeal substance, is the primitive cause of things, that the soul is a material substance, and that matter itself produces spiritual changes, or that the soul is a consequence of the bodily organization, by which matter is spiritualized and ennobled into mind. This is a species of infidelity which is peculiarly congenial to the vulgar taste, because it is easily comprehended, and does something to pacify an awakened conscience, while it admits the most fervent devotion to its material God.

The skepticism peculiar to our days seems to have sprung from the changes which have been going on in civil society. Previously to the French Revolution, the great mass of the population, in most of the countries of Europe, were sunk in degradation. That great event broke their chains. They soon perceived that they had been the dupes of a villainous priesthood ; that under the pretence of religion, they had cheated them out of every thing which man holds most dear. Of course they cut themselves off from all religious restraint. In their ignorance, or their madness, they confounded the wily priest, his corrupt religion, and Christianity together. In all the papal countries of Europe, the mass of the population, it is said, are either superstitious devotees to popery, or they are infidels. The entrance of a little light induced them to throw aside all religion, and rush into a heartless materialism. This baneful effect is seen elsewhere. The extension of civil privileges in the Protestant countries of Europe may be attended with a disastrous infidelity, unless religious education and the preaching of the gospel should go hand in hand. Men of common sense in the heathen and Mohammedan world, when their eyes are opened to the enormous absurdities of Islamism or Polytheism, are shocked. They are thrown from their balance, and they at once renounce all faith, placing Christianity in the same category with the herd of false religions. This constitutes one of the most interesting phenomena of our age. Could we inspect the hearts of men, we might see millions on the long road from Paris to Calcutta in this fearful transition-state. The movements of the times have caused them to throw off the monstrous absurdities which they could not endure, but

nothing has come in the place. When the unclean spirit has gone out, they pass through dry places seeking rest and finding none. The sun of righteousness does not arise on their perplexed and uncertain path.

A different form of skepticism is that broached a few years since by Dr. Strauss, of Tübingen,* in Germany, or rather, more boldly, learnedly, and systematically avowed and defended by him, and which, it is said, has a multitude of advocates. It transforms the historical facts of revelation into allegories. It denies the historical truth of the narratives of the New Testament, and treats them merely as symbols or fables. Our Saviour is, with Dr. Strauss, the symbol of humanity. Humanity, taken as a whole, is God manifest in the flesh. Eternity exists in this world. It is made up of the infinite succession of human generations. Eternal happiness is the progress by which mind gradually overcomes matter, and causes it to subserve its purposes. The system, if so it can be called, seems to be a mixture of deism, pantheism, and rank atheism.

Unhappily, not a few philosophical minds, that do not embrace any of these absurd and impious dogmas, are very far from coming up to the requisitions of Christianity. They are accustomed to regard this religion as one of the developments of the human mind, as a means of civilization, or as containing a very interesting chapter in the history of the human race. They may go further, and assert that it is indispensable to the repose and prosperity of nations; that every other system has been tried, and found in some points to be defective, while Christianity has as yet stood the test. These philosophical Christians are by no means inconsiderable in number at the present day. They are believers in general, but skeptics in particular. The gospel does not come to them with life-giving power, because they do not feel themselves to be in perishing need of its provisions.†

---

* We observe that Dr. Strauss has been thrown out of his office at Zurich by the indignant inhabitants of the canton.

† We regret that Mr. Hallam, in his recent very comprehensive and well-written "Introduction to the Literature of Europe," does not sympathize more deeply with the Lutheran Reformation, and with the recent developments of Christianity.

5. A striking fact pertaining to the present age is the rapid disappearance of the aboriginal tribes of various countries before the progress of what is called civilization. It is a melancholy truth, that the intercourse of Europeans and Americans with various uncivilized, aboriginal nations, has been characterized by enormous injustice on the one side, and untold sufferings on the other. By fraud and violence, these so-named civilized communities have usurped immense tracts of native territory, paying no regard to the rights of the inhabitants. Close on the process of usurpation has been that of extermination, which has been already carried to an incredible extent. In some cases, the work of annihilation is complete, while, in others, it is making the most fearful progress. There is scarcely a tribe, of any considerable size, that has had communication with large bodies of civilized nations, which is not the worse for the intercourse. Civilized diseases and vices have been so firmly ingrafted, that the utter extirpation of some native races seems to be not far distant.*

One of the most pernicious opinions which is entertained in relation to this subject is, that the fate of many aboriginal tribes is inevitable. It has been represented as one of the immutable laws of the Governor of the world, that wherever civilized man chooses to fix his abode, there the natives must melt away and be destroyed. But, in the language of the Rev. Dr. Philip, of Capetown, it is not the law of God that civilized man should destroy the natives of those countries which he colonizes. On the contrary, it is the law of wickedness. It is a law proceeding from the depravity of the human heart. "I know no argument," says Dr. P., "which can be adduced in defence of this system, which may not be adduced in defence of theft or murder in England." If all our legislators had been William Penns, and

---

We should not know, from any thing which he has said, that he was not a liberal, philosophical Jew, or a disciple of Ram Mohun Roy. Surely this is carrying impartiality a little too far.

* We cannot forbear to mention in this connection, the late visit at the Sandwich Islands, of the French frigate l'Artemise, Capt. Laplace. Will not Great Britain and the United States remonstrate?

all our Christians had possessed the spirit of David Brainerd, this necessity would never have been heard of. The Indians, on this continent, instead of melting away like flakes of snow which fall on the running stream, would have been incorporated with us in the enjoyment of all our rights and privileges, or living by our sides, independent and happy nations. On listening to the recital of the outrageous wrongs, which the people of this country have inflicted on the Indians, and then hearing the story of the ravages which the small-pox, or some other dreadful disorder, has caused in some of the more western tribes, we have thought that the latter had the envied lot. Better for the Mandans and the Black Feet to perish by mortal disease, than to come within the limits of civilization. The small-pox is a merciful visitation compared with the whiskey of the frontier, or with a treaty of the Senate of the United States! Destruction by the first-named does not involve *us* in guilt; it does not subject us to the vengeance of Heaven—a fiery deluge of which is most surely impending over us, and which may burn us with as scorching a heat as Old Spain has felt in her vitals for her most flagitious and inhuman treatment of this same Indian race.

6. We remark, once more, on the present age as characterized by the effusion of the Holy Spirit. It is not impossible but that these displays of Divine grace may have been too much undervalued by some of their real friends. Modern revivals of Christianity have been compared with those experienced in other generations, and the degeneracy of the former have been the subject of mourning and lamentation. But the student of church history need not be informed that the same or similar errors have attended, more or less, all general or national revivals. What seems to be a fresh error or mistake is but a modification of one long since exploded. Lay preaching, censoriousness, self-confidence, harsh judgments, extravagant speeches, looking for evidence of conversion in transient feelings or impulses, neglect of the written word, and similar follies, have always, sooner or later, to a greater or less extent, attended general revivals of religion. The truth is, that Christians have never yet been able to bear a long-continued Divine influence, because there has ever been a great deficiency in humility.

Revivals of religion will certainly be corrupted, until there is a great advance in liberality of views and spirituality of feeling among the ministers and churches of Jesus.

There is, however, a gradual approximation towards a better day. No outbreak of disorder which has occurred in the last thirty years, can be compared to the violence and confusion which existed in some parts of this country, soon after the middle of the last century. The war of the revolution was not entered upon with more earnestness than the contest which occupied the belligerant Old and New Lights, during the period of Governor Law's administration in Connecticut. But few men in modern times have acquired a more unenviable notoriety than this same governor on the one side, and John Davenport on the other.

The great lessons which are taught at such periods, are forbearance, meekness, candid judgment, moderation, and a resolute determination on the part of every Christian not to be prejudiced by *hearsay* reports or partisan evidence. Human nature, in such circumstances, betrays a deplorable weakness. This is true, not only of the moral part, but of the boasted intellectual powers. It is melancholy to reflect, how men of sound mind and of liberal education will fall into errors, and become the dupes of follies which, if it were possible, would disgrace Matthias the prophet, or the Mormon heresiarch.

Revivals of religion will partake, inevitably, of the general character of the times. The religion of our countrymen, in the last century, and in the present, too, has been fundamentally affected by the mode of admission to the church which was practised and defended by such men as Increase Mather and Solomon Stoddard. The revivals, in our days, are colored by passing events and existing opinions. There is, unquestionably, a deficiency in doctrinal knowledge, or a tendency to superficial investigation, or to loose habits of study, not universal, but, nevertheless, far too common. The circumstances of a new country, which is rapidly filling with inhabitants; the acrimonious political contests; the boundless and reckless spirit of adventure; the unsettled nature of the great monied concerns of the country; the frequency, and consequent ferment, of our popular elections; the opening of the eyes of men, suddenly, to certain great moral evils; the emigration to this country of men enter-

taining all sorts of religion, and many of them entertaining no sort at all; these, and various other causes, inevitably tinge, if they do not radically corrupt, the revivals of religion which prevail. The Christian carries his political, or his money-making spirit into the meeting for praise and prayer. If it be suppressed for a time, it is sure, at length, to break out, and show its bitter fruits.

Such facts, however, do not disprove the Divine origin of these influences. The fountain is pure; the conduit is earthen. The effects are mixed, because man, after his spiritual transformation, remains, to a lamentable extent, under the power of error and sin. The effects of these revivals, nevertheless, are great and salutary. The number of pious persons now living, is, undoubtedly, much greater than at any former period. Many of them are not superficial religionists, but they *know* in whom they have believed, and understand, to some extent, the hope of their calling. They cherish a fraternal affection for each other. With the miserable sectarian divisions of the times, they have little sympathy. Some of them are prevented by ecclesiastical barriers from manifesting their charity, but the true feeling burns in their breasts, and, at the proper time, it will flame forth. One genuine result of these revivals is seen in the *upholding* of the benevolent enterprises of the day. We say *upholding*, for they might be commenced in a mere temporary excitement. But that spring-time has passed away. The trial and the burden of the hot and long summer days are now to be borne. And there is no shrinking from the dust and the sun. The feelings which multitudes have exhibited in every part of the land in respect to the embarrassments of our principal benevolent societies are worthy of particular observation. It shows an undying attachment to the work. It proves that many Christians have embarked in the cause for life and for death.

We are impressively taught, by the signs of the times, the importance of maintaining a calm and serene trust in God. There is no occasion for excessive anxiety. We are not to conclude that *strange* things are happening to us. Neither the world nor the church have ever been free, for any considerable time, from great excitement. If we imagine that our generation is more remarkable, in this respect, than

any which has preceded it, we only shut our eyes to the light of history. It is not to be compared, for instance, with the period when our Saviour was on the earth. The Jewish state was near its final catastrophe. The heavy tread of the invading Roman legions could be heard in the distance. Fearful signs were just ready to break forth in the earth and in the skies; and men's hearts were failing them for fear. At this eventful crisis, our Saviour was perfectly undisturbed, while he addressed to his disciples this most weighty admonition: in your *patience* possess ye your souls. He is a poor soldier who is scared by the shaking of a leaf.

The duty of exercising a kind and courteous spirit is equally obvious. No manner or degree of ill-treatment will justify those bitter retorts, and cutting invectives, which are so common. If one feels called on to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints, let it be his object to win over the caviller, or skeptic, to the cause of truth. It is certainly possible to defend what is right, with those deep convictions of its importance, with that dignity and decorum, with that serenity of mind and candor of judgment, which will do more to commend Christianity, than all which the arts of the most practised logician can accomplish without them. We are to show that our religion *is* what it claims to be—urbane, generous, harmonizing whatever it touches, and shutting away no living thing as an outlaw from its sympathy. On the other hand, there is no occasion for wavering, fickleness, veering now to one extreme and then to its opposite. We may not shrink from a manly avowal of opinions which we honestly entertain. The most laudable enterprise is liable to imperfection; the most praiseworthy undertaking may be mismanaged. We are not justified in renouncing the right because of the wrong, in abandoning the great good because of the collateral and subordinate mischief. When there is a mad rush to one extreme, none but a fool will precipitate himself to the other.

Once more, we are bound to cherish confident and cheering hopes of the ultimate and universal spread of truth and righteousness. The world, indeed, *lieth* in wickedness. Its dark places are full of the habitations of cruelty. The great empire of darkness seems to be hardly entered. A few outposts only have been captured. Civilization—with a nominal Christianity—has its attendant vices, some of them

of deep root and of enormous growth. Improvements in the arts and sciences open wider channels for corruption, and more expeditious modes for doing mischief. The extension of our settlements westward is connected with flagrant injustice to the aborigines. We cheat them out of their land one day, and murder them with our whiskey the next. The ends of the land are brought together by means which are destroying the sanctity of the Sabbath day. Our canvass is said to whiten every sea, but too frequently it wafts that poison which strows every shore, that it touches, with dead men's bones.

But we must not dwell exclusively on these dark pictures. Men are not predestinated to do wrong. It is very possible to linger so long on the sad condition of ruined human nature, that we shall become misanthropic seers of evil, and nothing but evil, perpetually brooding over the degeneracy of the age, unfitting ourselves, and all around us, for the world in which we live. God has spread out before us encouragements of the most ample import. For instance, there are certain wants which men feel, which all men feel, which no ingenuity of skepticism can eradicate, nor, for any long time, darken. These wants exist in the nature of man, and they *must* remain. The need of an atonement, and of an almighty, sanctifying Spirit, are not arbitrary, conventional matters. They do not depend on law, or agreement, or fashion. They are as indestructible as the soul of man, while he exists in a state of probation. From such facts as these, we draw strong encouragement. They are, in a sense, safeguards, in respect to fatal error. They remonstrate against him who seeks to drown his conscience in any specious delusion.

Besides, Christianity is making progress. She is effecting some advance every year. This can be said of no false religion. Islamism and Paganism do not hold their own. Every change in them is for the worse. Every alteration is a deterioration. The Christian nations are gradually becoming stronger and more united, growing into an aggregate that nothing on earth can resist. The countries which are principally affecting Pagan and Mohammedan nations, are Great Britain and the United States. To these, Divine Providence seems to have intrusted, in a great measure, the destinies of the unevangelized world.

The more we look on general movements, abstracting our eyes from particular evils, we shall be encouraged and filled with hope. Under the guidance of an Almighty Providence and a regenerating Spirit, powers are at work which no malice of men or of devils can arrest. The world is given to Jesus, and his it shall be.

ARTICLE X.

Inquiries respecting Free Agency.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.—BY THE EDITOR.

The author of the following "*Inquiries*" is unknown to ourselves. They are, however, furnished by a highly respected correspondent, who urges their publication in the present No. of the Repository, and assures us of the sincerity and candor with which they are propounded by the writer. They are addressed to the Rev. Dr. Woods, and appear to have been principally suggested by his article on the same subject in our last No., page 174, seq. As we hope to hear again from Dr. W. on this subject, we presume that he will gladly avail himself of the hints here presented in regard to several points, on which the positions maintained in his former article are supposed, by some, to be vulnerable. We cannot doubt that he will be gratified with the publication of these *Inquiries* at the present stage of the discussion. They will furnish him with an occasion to present more fully his views on the points referred to, and we doubt not that he will answer them in the same spirit of candor with which they are here urged upon his attention. He will also excuse us for presenting them, in compliance with the request of our correspondent, and for the reasons urged by the writer, anonymously.—Editor.

To the Editor of the American Biblical Repository:

Sir,

I understand that one of your rules as an editor is, that no *anonymous* composition shall be printed in your Miscellany. But this rule, as one might reasonably expect, is not like the law of the Medes and Persians; for you have already pub-

lished, more than once, pieces of considerable length, *without* the name of the writer; and your brief notices, at the end of each number of your work, are anonymous. Are we to regard all which is anonymous as *editorial?* In cases where nothing is said to the contrary, I suppose we may presume that the compositions are editorial. On the other hand, where you make an apology for publishing an *anonymous* piece, you tell us at once, by implication, what your general principle is; and the mass of readers are satisfied, as I would hope, that you have sufficient reasons for a departure from a general principle in the particular case which you specify. To save *you* the necessity of apologizing in the present case, I shall make *my own* apology; and this is, that I do not take the attitude, in the present communication, of one who expresses or defends his own views on a subject, in respect to which those views are definitely and finally made up. I come before the public, through your Miscellany, principally as an *inquirer*. I have difficulties in respect to the subject of FREE AGENCY, which neither Dr. Woods, nor your anonymous correspondent on whom he criticises, has wholly removed. And as I do not undertake to teach, I may be excused, when I take the attitude of a *learner* and not of a master, for not developing my tyro-condition, in the way of committing my name to the public. Enough that I am obliged to develop so much of it, by the questions which I have to ask.

These inquiries are not, or at least they certainly are not designed to be, as is often the case, an assumption of the attitude of a master who undertakes to shew his pupil how dull he is, by putting questions which he feels that dulness itself might answer, or which it must surely feel reproved for not answering. Dr. Woods, to whom I specially address the following inquiries, because he has fairly given his name to the public, will not, I sincerely hope and trust, indulge the suspicion, that I am aiming at any degradation of his character, or of his *critique* in your last number, when I present my questions to him, and make the basis of them his remarks on *Fatalism and Free Agency*. I am, in reality, an *inquirer*, in the general sense of this word, as to the science of Mental Philosophy. In my present remarks and questions, I am simply so. So far as I have formed opinions on this deeply interesting subject, they are of the *Eclectic*

cast. I belong to no particular school in metaphysics, not having yet found *terra firma* extensive enough to choose and proclaim my dwelling-place. I find difficulties in most of the *systems* of mental philosophy that I occasionally read, and love to read; and Dr. Woods is not the only writer, with whom I have an account of this nature which I should like to settle. But he is most recently before the public, in respect to the subject just named. He is a writer, if I rightly estimate him, who will not parry off a responsibility which he has thus publicly assumed. I may add too, that he is one who does not appear to need wily expedients for avoiding difficulties, but is ready to meet them and look them in the face, and not to quit the arena until it is fairly known who is entitled to the wreath of victory. I like the spirit of candour and kindness, which he has in general shewn in the recent criticisms to which I refer. I approve, moreover, of the discussion itself. It is time that more were said and done, in relation to this great subject. It is easy to see, that at present the public in general are not ready nor willing to stereotype and make exclusive the former publications in respect to Free Agency and Fatalism, which have long had their day of almost exclusive dominion among us. If we may judge from present appearances, it seems to be no more probable that they will do this, than that they will go back to the logic of Aristotle, or to the natural philosophy, astronomy, and chemistry of the 17th century. New times, and new attitudes of the human mind, and new acquisitions, i. e. new additions to the old stock of knowledge, demand new treatises and new writers. It is not possible in the nature of things, that the human mind, in such an attitude of energy as it has been for the last fifty years, should not have made some advancement in all the sciences, either as to a more extensive knowledge of the principles of them, or as to the more successful development of the sciences themselves. I suppose this may be true of *mental science;* nay, tyro as I am in it, I have, in respect to this matter, so far decided for myself, as to be fully persuaded that such is the fact.

As the maxim: *Audi alteram partem*, is rather a favourite with me, I have read, with no little interest, the remarks of Dr. Woods to which I have referred. Those of the anonymous writer, on whom he criticises, I have also read; and

with a deep conviction that this writer is one who thinks and reasons for himself, or for *herself;* it matters not which, except that, if it be the latter, I have only to say, that a *man's* brain must have been put into a *woman's* head. For one I must say, also, that I like good-natured discussion of deeply interesting principles. *Dispute* I do not love, and never *can* (if Dr. W. will let me employ his philosophical word to express myself), until I have a new *taste* in some way communicated to me, or (to speak with our friends the phrenologists) a new development of *combativeness* is added to the conformity of my head.

I am not, and cannot be, one of those who declaim against all efforts to acquire a better knowledge of our mental powers, by reproachfully calling them *metaphysics.* In its proper place, and duly meted and bounded, metaphysics is an elevated and noble science. And as Dr. Woods has intimated (p. 193,) that he may yet have something more to say on the subject which he has discussed, I take the liberty, which (I must believe it after what he has said) he will cheerfully concede to me, of asking some questions in relation to what he has already said, that, if answered satisfactorily, may tend to make his future communications still more profitable and instructive. He will be pleased to know, conversant as he is with the subjects of metaphysical disquisition, what difficulties have arisen in the minds of tyros like myself, and of inquirers after some *terra firma* in that region, some views of which he has already exhibited. If my questions arise from ignorance, he will patiently bear with this in a learner; or if they have any good foundation in the want of satisfactory views in some part of his criticisms, he will rejoice in an opportunity of explanation, which will at once guard in future against misapprehension by such a class of readers as myself, and at the same time communicate to them welcome instruction.

I have said enough to *define my position* (as the language of the day will have it), and my wishes. Lest my preface should be longer than my book, I proceed, without further explanation, to state the difficulties that I have met with, in the attentive perusal of Dr. Woods' communication.

(1) On p. 187, Dr. W. puts this question respecting the unregenerate man: "While he remains in his natural state, can he, by the power of his will, prevent it, and call

forth the affection of love, and so be subject to the law of God?" The question, as the context shews, is designed to be a strong affirmation that he *cannot* do this.

In respect to such an affirmation or sentiment, I have some difficulties, the removal of which will entitle Dr. W. to my most sincere thanks.

First, in what sense does he mean to employ the important word CAN, in this statement? This word, connected with a negative expressed or implied, is often employed, in the Scriptures and in common parlance, for the expression of any thing which appears very difficult, or very revolting, or very improbable. Thus Joseph, when tempted to sin, exclaimed; "How *can* I do this great wickedness?" Every day we say: How *can* an intemperate man reform? How *can* an honest man cheat his neighbor? How *can* a true Christian love the world? In all these, and in all the like cases, the word *can*, with an implied or expressed negative, is intended to designate merely the idea that the thing spoken of is very difficult, improbable, or disagreeable. Is *this* the sense, in which Dr. W. means the word to be understood here? But,

Secondly; the context renders this sense of the word, as employed by him, very improbable; as we shall see in the sequel. Taking the word *can*, then, in another sense, and understanding Dr. Woods to mean, that the unregenerate man has actually *no power* to love God, and to be subject to his law, I wish to invite his attention to that host of texts in the Bible, addressed to all men without distinction, *commanding* them all to love God and to be subject to his law. Does God command sinners to do what is actually impossible? *That he does* COMMAND *all men to love him*, is absolutely certain; it admits of no doubt, and of no dispute. In what sense, then, I ask, is it actually *impossible* for unsanctified men to love him? Is it in such a sense as precludes the possibility that an unsanctified man can change his present state for a better one? Or does Dr. W. merely mean, that so long as the sinner does not make such a change, he will continue only to sin in all his moral acts? If the former (which strikes me as Dr. Woods' meaning), then what are we to say of the COMMAND directed to all the unregenerate: "Make you a new heart, and a new spirit; for why will ye die?" Does God *command* the sinner to do what is abso-

lutely impossible; and threaten him with everlasting death, because he does not achieve a work which nothing but Omnipotence itself can accomplish?

But perhaps Dr. W. will say, that he has merely affirmed, that the sinner cannot love and obey God, "by the power of his will." If now this should be said; then I am forced to inquire, whether he means, that the sinner may, and can bring himself to love and obey God in some other way; the power of the *will* not being at all exerted? Has he other faculties besides the will, that render obedience on his part to the command in question a real possibility? And what kind of *love* and *obedience* must there be, when "the power of the will" is left out of the question? Can it be *willing* love and obedience?

(2) On p. 187 Dr. Woods has said, that "unrenewed men *invariably* have wrong affections and desires, and perfectly holy beings *invariably* have right affections and desires, in view of moral objects."

I have, as an inquirer, a difficulty here from which I would fain be freed. Angels were once *all* perfectly holy beings; have they all "*invariably* had right affections and desires?" Our first parents were once sinless beings; did they "*invariably* retain right affections and desires?"—But Dr. W. says (and perhaps in some way this may modify his meaning), "*in view of moral objects.*" I do not know that I understand his meaning here. He has applied this *view of moral objects*, both to *wrong* affections and desires and to *right* affections and desires. It would seem, then, that the same objects occasion wrong affections in the one class, and right affections in the other; and so he represents the matter, p. 187. In respect then to the *first* sin of the fallen angels—all the moral objects were before them, the moment before they sinned, which ever had been before them; and even if we suppose new ones to have supervened, yet as they were perfectly holy, they must *invariably* have continued to feel nothing but right affections and desires. And just the same must be true in regard to our first parents. They were once perfectly holy. But here there comes in a new excitement—the temptation of Satan. Yet how could this affect them? What Satan tempted them to do, was something of a moral nature. But since, in view of moral objects, "perfectly holy beings must *inva-*

riably have *right* affections and desires"—what possible influence could temptation have over our progenitors? It may be, that I am breathing *Bœotian* air, and that my circulation through the brain is therefore irregular and impeded, and so I *can not* think clearly; but if Dr. W., who lives on high ground and in the purest air of the country, will set me in a plain and clear path here, he shall receive the most grateful thanks which I can render. I *can not* make any thing more or less out of Dr. Woods' affirmations, than the simple position: 'Once a perfectly holy being, *always* so; once a sinner, *always* so.' If indeed he admits a change in either case, then a new physical and psychological creation, in the literal sense, is absolutely indispensable; and then, of course, men are not real *agents*, either when falling from a holy state, or rising to one.

(3) On p. 187 Dr. Woods also says, that "the divine law preëminently aims to control the affections and desires of the heart."

This proposition seems, at first view, to be a very reasonable one. But surrounded as it is by such declarations as I have already noticed, I need more light in respect to the author's views of it. *In what respect* does the law undertake to control these affections and desires? *To what* is the law addressed? If to the understanding and the conscience—then how is any saving effect to be produced; unless they are brought to exert an influence upon the *will?* Then, as Dr. Woods has said that "the will has *no power* to call forth the affection of love and subjection to God," of course we cannot suppose, that the divine law is at all addressed to this faculty, but is directed to the *affections* and *desires*. But how are they to be operated upon by the divine law? On p. 186 and p. 187, Dr. W. declares, that 'holy and sinful affections and desires, in the saint and in the sinner, arise *spontaneously* from the presence or contemplation of moral objects.' So when the saint contemplates the divine law, he *spontaneously* loves and desires the holiness which it requires; and when the sinner contemplates it, his enmity and dissatisfaction are *spontaneously* called forth. Such is his illustration. What other tendency, then, can the divine law have upon the mind of a sinner, except uniformly and always to increase his hatred of all which is

good and holy, and so thrust him further and further from salvation? And what is there *spontaneous* in this case? Here are the commands of the divine law presented to the sinner's mind; and before he is prepared to exercise any act of the will in respect to them, a *spontaneous hatred* and *enmity* decide the question what is to be done. He does not continue to be a sinner, merely or principally because he *wills* or *chooses* to be so, but he remains such from the *spontaneity* of his very nature, over which, as Dr. Woods declares, *the will has no power*. What can preaching the divine law ever do, then, but simply aggravate the awful doom of sinners?

If in asking these questions, I have wandered away from Dr. W.'s meaning, then he can easily recall my wandering steps, by telling us how the divine law, according to his statement of the subject, is adapted *to make sinners any better*, and how it is, or can be, "a schoolmaster to bring them to Christ." I do not see my way clear, on his ground; and I shall be truly thankful for more light.

(4) On p. 188 Dr. Woods says: "It is a common sentiment, that the sinfulness of men is great, in proportion as their passions and desires are awakened suddenly and uncontrollably in view of forbidden objects."

At first view, one can not, perhaps, see any good reason to controvert this sentiment, provided it be taken with certain limitations, and in some qualified sense. For example, the word *uncontrollably* here might denote, that the passions awakened are not in reality controlled, but suffered to develope themselves in *action*. Then, there can be no doubt of the wickedness of them. Nor does there seem to be much reason for doubt of their sinfulness, when a peculiar state of excitability as to bad passions is the result of the previous gratification of them. But these limitations, or any other, are not made by the writer. He goes on immediately to state a case, in which revenge, envy, covetousness, and pride, are awakened by their appropriate exciting causes, and so awakened that the subject of these passions "finds it exceedingly difficult to check them;" and then he asks: "Whether we do not look upon him [the man in whom these passions are] as uncommonly depraved and wicked?"

To all this now I could assent, provided he had conjoined

some limitations and modifications. But unlimited as his views now stand, I have some difficulties in my mind respecting them; and he will permit me to state them.

Suppose both the parents of some particular child are, and have long been, habitually intemperate; and that this child has inherited the curse of a rabid appetite for intoxicating drinks—an occurrence not unusual. We will further suppose, what sometimes also happens, that violent, and sudden, and "exceedingly difficult to check," as this appetite has been, the child still has checked it, and has an actual abhorrence of indulging it, because he sees the consequences. Is that child guilty of *intemperance?* Or rather (to use Dr. W.'s own language), is he "uncommonly depraved and wicked," because he has such an appetite? To say so—what is it but to contradict the spontaneous moral judgment of the whole world? I should even be inclined to ask another question: Who is most truly worthy of the laurels to be bestowed on account of *real temperance*, as a *practical* and *active* virtue, the man who never had the least appetite for strong drink, nay even had a disgust of it, and therefore has refrained from it, or the man who has refrained although beset and attacked with a rabid appetite to indulge in it?

Take another case of a different tenor. A man has for many years been a *debauchee*. He repents and becomes a Christian, and abhors his former sins, and breaks off entirely from them. Yet he is often and violently assailed with desires and passions like those of former days. The presence of appropriate objects never fails "spontaneously" to call forth these desires; although, on his part, he never fails to combat and subdue them. Does now the mere rise or existence of these feelings determine, that such a man "is uncommonly depraved and wicked," in his present state? Or are we to regard his triumphs as some of the highest achievements of the principle of virtuous purity?

Have I any ground for asking such questions, or of doubting whether the unlimited statements of Dr. W., now under consideration, are true propositions in casuistry? If so, then Dr. Woods, as a philosopher and casuist, certainly needs more caution in such statements. If not, then it is in his power to show wherein I err.

He appeals to the consciousness of Christians for proof, that "desires burning *unawares* within them," are evidences

of desperate wickedness. They may, I concede, be evidences of *having been* very wicked, or of having inherited a constitution greatly vitiated. But how they can be proof of present wickedness, provided they are in all cases immediately resisted and never fostered or indulged, I am not at present aware. I need more light to see this point as he does; perhaps he can impart it. If so, I will cheerfully receive it.

But inasmuch as the whole tenor of what he says in relation to this subject, assumes the ground that all desires and affections which would lead to the doing of things forbidden, are as really sinful as voluntary actions; and assumes that they are so, even when they are *spontaneously* and *uncontrollably* excited by the presence of appropriate objects, without any act of the will or choice; I have still further questions to ask, and need still more light.

We read that our blessed Saviour "was *tempted* IN ALL POINTS as we are." Had he then *any susceptibility of being impressed* or *moved* by the presence of exciting objects, e. g. such as were proffered him by Satan, during his temptation? If he had *no* susceptibility of being impressed—if he had no rising desires or emotions, like our own on such occasions, then how was he tempted *in all points* as we are? If he had such emotions, and these emotions are, as Dr. Woods says, *sins of the deepest dye*, then how was he tempted—and yet remained *without sin?* It would afford serious relief to my mind, in any way to be delivered from this dilemma.

In a word; all our *involuntary* emotions and impressions appear to be put, by Dr. Woods, into the same scale, and are to be proved by the same weights, as our emotions and impressions that would lead us to sin, but which are excited by our own fault, or our own criminal negligence. How can this be vindicated from the charge of mixing and confounding together things that widely differ? For what the Maker of heaven and earth himself made us to be, we are *not* accountable; for what we *do*, in the enlarged sense of that word, we are.

(5) Dr. Woods says (p. 189), that "*affections* and *desires* are mental actions of as high an order as *volitions*." In connection with this he also says, that "free agency makes the mind a producing cause of its own emotions, affections, and desires, equally as it makes it the cause of volition."

What then are we to think of the argument at length, on p. 186 seq., to shew that the mere presence of appropriate objects *spontaneously* awakens these desires, and that even the power of the will can do nothing to prevent this? Good beings, he says, *invariably* have right feelings in view of moral objects; and bad men *invariably* have bad ones. Does it then actually belong to the nature of free agency, *in a state of probation*, to produce *uniformly* and *invariably* one, and only one, set of emotions? Is there any example of such a uniformity, in heaven or on earth?

Besides; what is *free agency?* THE POWER OF CHOICE IN RESPECT TO MORAL ACTIONS, has been generally supposed to constitute the essence of free agency in a moral being. But what is *the power of choice*, in respect to desires and impressions *spontaneously* produced by the presence of appropriate objects, and *invariably* produced, and produced beyond the power of the will to control them? For all of this he asserts of the passions and desires—and now what has free agency to do with these? It must be that I have formed no idea of what he can mean by free agency. I beg him, therefore, to be more explicit, for the sake of learners, like me.

Yet more; what is meant when he tells us that "affections and desires are of as *high an order* as volitions?" High in what respect? In respect to intrinsic value, or accountability, or freedom, or what? The intellect and reason of men are of a pretty *high order;* but I do not know well how to compare their height with that of volition, or with that of the affections and desires. I want more light, in order to determine what the height in question is.

(6) On p. 190 Dr. Woods labours to shew, that our *volitions* are as much controlled by God, as our desires and affections.

Now there is a sense, in which all things are controlled by God. He is *Lord* of all. But how can I accede to the statement, that because *motives* of some kind are necessary to volition, therefore volition is just as much the subject of active and efficient control, as the emotions and desires are, according to his statement? Dr. Woods himself represents the latter as *spontaneously* arising from the presence of appropriate objects; as *invariably* doing so; and as being beyond all control of the will in this respect. In a word, he

makes man a simple *passive recipient* in all these; while *volition* is an executive power of the soul, put forth by a free agent.—'But,' says he, 'volition depends as much on *motives*, as the passions and feelings on their appropriate exciting objects.' Still I have to ask: On motives drawn from things *ab extra* only? He himself concedes that this is not so. Suppose then, that from its own nature, state, or condition, the soul chooses, i. e. wills, this or that; is this a case to be put on a par with the desires *necessarily* and involuntarily excited in us by objects without the soul?

If it be said: "God has arranged both," will this satisfy an inquiring mind? God made both men and brutes; does it follow that both are alike free and moral agents? If God has made *free-agents*, has he not given the soul a power of choice, after all the motives are placed before it which the nature of any case admits? But if the case of the *passions* and of *volition* are indeed upon a *par*, can there be any such power? There is *no choice* at all to the passions, according to Dr. Woods' statement; how then, if this be true, can an *ultimate* choice, when motive has done its utmost, be in the power of a free agent in his volitions?

Dr. Woods will see, in looking over p. 191, that he has made a singularly incorrect statement of the *orthodox* doctrine respecting the influence of Adam's sin. As his words now stand, they represent the orthodox doctrine as maintaining, that "native depravity, and all our sinful actions and volitions, which are the invariable consequence of Adam's sin, are Fatalism, entirely precluding free, accountable agency." I trust he does not mean to make such accusations against the orthodoxy of the Schools. If I have misunderstood his declaration, he will pardon me. I have no design or wish to misconstrue it; and the fact that I can make neither more nor less out of it, than what I have just stated, shews that his words need some correction.

I have done; although at least half as many more questions have started up, in reading the *Critique* referred to, as I have now stated; questions of about the same difficulty, and for which I should be glad to obtain some satisfactory answer.

Dr. Woods himself will concede, that I have approached him with the spirit of kindness and respect, although I have freely indulged in asking questions. I will not suppose, for

a moment, that he will take amiss my questions or remarks. They are merely adapted to call him out on subjects which he loves to canvass; and they offer him a good opportunity to enlighten a great host of inquirers, all much in the same plight with myself. Indeed, what better opportunity can he wish, in order to diffuse light over our country on these momentous subjects?

Dr. W. has pointed out at least some inaccuracies in the writer whose essay he has canvassed. If he is disposed to ask, why I have not put some questions to that writer, as well as to him, I have a ready answer—as before suggested. That writer is an *incognito;* but Dr. W. is before the public: that writer may be young, but he is a veteran of half a century's discipline. May I say one thing more? Dr. W. has asserted, that the views of the author on whom he criticises, are in direct and palpable opposition to God's word, to the dictates of conscience, and to the experience of devoted Christians." These are, to say the least, high charges. They go for the whole. They surely ought, then, to be sustained by radical and fundamental reasoning and argument, and plain and irrefragable conclusions. A writer who takes such high ground as this, should have no chinks in his own building; no tottering or bowing places in his own wall, no dark spot on his plat where so much light is needed; no tripping or crossing track in psychology or theology. If he can indeed satisfactorily answer the questions now put, I, at least, will concede to him the praise of *omne talit punctum;* and he will be entitled to the grateful acknowledgment of thousands of others.

I do trust, after the general kindness and candour and explicitness which he has shewn in the remarks that have called forth my questions, that he will be candid, and kind, and plain, and direct in his answers; and will not, as many disputants do, call hard names, or insinuate that there is some wrong motive at the bottom of such questions. I have, as I trust he has, an antipathy to every thing of this nature. I do trust too, that when he comes to the pinch of some questions, he will meet it like a man, and either solve the difficulty, or else concede the consequences, if it must remain unsolved. There is a *circumgyration* in matters of this kind, to which some disputants never fail to resort, when a real exigency comes. If he should feel pressed by any of these questions, I will

not suppose, for a moment, that he will place himself on a level with such disputants. Dr. W. may perhaps see, in many of these questions, nothing more than merely the evidence of a *tyroship* in metaphysics. Very good. The writer professes to be an *inquirer* merely—and, if he pleases, will not be angry at being deemed a tyro. Conceding this to be a fact, however, it will not be unbecoming for a master in Israel, to condescend so far as to solve the doubts, remove the difficulties, and instruct the mind, of a somewhat perplexed

Inquirer.

P. S. One question above all, I wish to have thoroughly cleared up. Dr. W. makes us mere *passive recipients* (pp. 186–188) in all our passions and desires. The effort to extricate the matter from this position on p. 189, is wholly unsatisfactory; and it contradicts what he has before said. The general tenor of all his reasonings seems to demonstrate that the matter lies in his mind in this shape—viz. that of *spontaneous*, *invariable*, *uncontrollable* passions, etc., over which the will has no power. These are his own representations. On this ground, I have an ardent desire to know how the command to *love* God and our neighbour is to be *obeyed*. What sort of obedience, is an *involuntary* affection, *uncontrollable*, *invariable?* What is the nature of the obligation which lies on the sinner, in this case, to exchange his enmity for love? Does God actually demand, in this case, what is feasible and practicable on the part of the sinner? or is it like a command to iron, that it shall yield itself to the attraction of the magnet? If Dr. W. can scatter light over this dark—*dark* place, he will lay all Christendom under obligation to him. It is clear also, from what he says about *volition*, that he regards it as being as *necessarily* governed by motives, as desires and passions are by their appropriate objects. In one sense this may be admitted, viz. that a choice must be made in view of some supposed good. But if, when motives have done their whole work upon the soul, the *power of choice* in any and every case is still in reserve, and is absolutely essential to free agency—what correctness, or justice can there be, in comparing with this the case of involuntary and invariable desires and feelings? What justice in comparing a *passive receptivity*, with an *essentially active power* of a being made in the image of his Maker?

ARTICLE IX.

Remarks on an Article denominated "Campbellism. By Rev. R. W. Landis:"—Am. Bib. Repos. for Jan. and April, 1839.—Vol. I. p. 94, seq. and p. 295, seq.

By Alexander Campbell, Bethany, Va.

INTRODUCTORY AND EXPLANATORY NOTE, BY THE EDITOR.

Those of our readers, who possess the first Nos. of the current series of the Repository, will readily recur to the article on "Campbellism," by Mr. Landis, above referred to. That article was read with much interest, and several of our most intelligent correspondents in the western and southern States, who are much better acquainted, than ourselves, with the peculiarities of Campbellism and their practical influence, have taken occasion to express their high sense of the ability and justice of Mr. Landis' discussion.

In the mean time Mr. Campbell has manifested much disturbance and dissatisfaction with what has appeared to others to be an able and candid exposition of his published views. He has replied to Mr. Landis at some length in his own publication, "*The Millennial Harbinger*," and, (if we may judge from one No. only, which we have seen,) with great severity and rudeness.

The spirit with which he has urged this subject upon our own attention has been truly extraordinary. After addressing us in one or two communications which we had delayed answering, he addressed a letter to the "Publisher of the Am. Bib. Repository," dated December 13, 1839, accusing both the publisher and the editor of having "most wantonly and cruelly slandered" him, etc. etc., and threatening a civil prosecution for damages.

In reply to the letter above referred to, the following was addressed to Mr. Campbell, which, we are informed, Mr. C. has announced in his publication, as an "apology" for Mr. Landis' article in the Repository, etc. As some of our friends have expressed some alarm at this announcement, we insert our letter to Mr. C. entire, that the public may be disabused of all false impressions concerning it; premising also that this is the only communication we have ever made to Mr. C.

New-York, Jan. 2, 1840.

Rev. A. Campbell,

Dear Sir,—Your letter of the 13th, addressed to the publisher of the Am. Bib. Repository and enclosing $5, was received on the 20th of Dec. ult. Enclosed you have my receipt for the $5. Your name is stricken from the list of our subscribers, in compliance with your request.

The spirit of your letter appears to me to be such as you will, on further reflection, yourself disapprove. On that point, therefore, I need only remark that it is not in my heart to return "railing for railing, but contrariwise, blessing." I am not conscious of ever having indulged a wish to injure you; and I am sure I indulge no such wish or intention at present. Personally I have no acquaintance with you. I never saw you, and I am not aware that I have ever read ten pages of your writings. Nor have I ever formed any acquaintance with the sect of the Campbellite Baptists, of which you are the reputed leader. I had frequently heard you spoken of in the Western and Southern States as maintaining peculiar sentiments on the subject of Water Baptism and some other points, and as the leader of a numerous sect, denominated as above. But my associations and intercourse were wholly with other denominations of professing Christians, and that too in the prosecution of objects which led me away from the discussion of the peculiarities of your faith or those of your followers. I had also heard of your public debates with respectable individuals, but do not recollect that I ever read a page of those debates on either side. My impressions, therefore, both of yourself and your system, though decidedly unfavorable, were altogether crude and unsettled.

Such were the facts in regard to my own state of mind on this general subject, when the Rev. Mr. Landis wrote me proposing to furnish an article for the Repository, *on Campbellism*. It appeared to me to be a subject of sufficient interest to justify the reception of such an article. I had confidence also in Mr. Landis' ability to discuss the subject thoroughly, and had no reason to doubt his disposition to do it with candor. At that time also I was ignorant of the fact that Mr. Landis had ever had any dispute with you in regard to your sentiments, and did not suppose that he was at all known to you. It was not until quite recently I have learned that he had been assailed in your Periodical and challenged to discuss your system, etc. Of all this I was wholly ignorant, and supposed Mr. Landis to have been moved in his discussion only by a desire to defend the truth against error, without the slightest mingling of personal considerations or feelings. His article was accordingly received and published in the Nos. of the Repository for January and April last.

I make the foregoing statement to assure you that you labor under an entire mistake, when you suppose I have intentionally slandered you, or that I have ever entertained any other feelings towards you than those of kindness and regret. I read Mr. Landis' article with care before committing it to the press, and erased several expressions in it which seemed to me to be unnecessarily severe, but added nothing to it. In my examination of the article I did not in any instance recur to the authorities referred to by Mr. Landis. They were not in my possession;

and, as his quotations were referred to page, chapter, verse, etc. with so much apparent accuracy, I did not hesitate to trust the writer for their correctness. He too is responsible for the sentiments and statements which the article contains, as you will see by turning to my "*Introductory Observations*" in the same No. of the Repository (p. 5), where I say, the editor "will not be responsible for the correctness of every sentiment which may be advanced by writers. As a general rule, each article will be published with the name of its author, who will be held responsible for the defence of his own position," etc. Guided by this rule, and presuming the quotations made by Mr. Landis to be correct, (and also his statements,) his arguments appeared to me to be highly satisfactory, and to justify the commendation of them which is expressed in my Note, page 130. I think also that you will yourself admit, that, granting Mr. Landis' positions to be sustained, as they appear to me to be, they are sufficient to justify the language of my Note in reference to yourself. If however you regard any of the statements of Mr. Landis, in the article referred to, as untrue, or as personally injurious, you are at liberty to deny or refute them in the Repository. If you wish to do this, I will grant you space for a brief article in the April No., provided you will forward it in season to reach me before the 1st of March next. I say, a brief article, because I am sure your object may be answered in a few pages, better than by a protracted discussion of the subject, and my wish is to dispose of this discussion in as brief a space as I can, and do justice to the parties. It is only because you complain of *injustice* that I consent to admit any thing from you on the subject. But *personal injury* I am unwilling to inflict upon any man: and if you have been slandered by Mr. Landis, as you suppose, it is but just that you should be allowed to deny the charges of which you complain, in the pages of the same work which contains the alleged slander. You will, therefore, oblige by letting me know, without unnecessary delay, whether I may expect a communication from your pen for the Repository, as above proposed.

Your letter arrived quite too late to receive any satisfactory notice in the Repository for the present month, which was all made up and nearly all printed. And the delay I trust will not be disadvantageous to you, as you will now have ample time to do justice to your own views of the subject, which, if you will suppress the excitement of your feelings, and write with candor and courtesy, will be better every way, than any explanation of the state of the case from me.

I shall be happy to hear from you soon, and your next letter, I trust will be such, both in spirit and manner, as to command that respect from me, which it will be my endeavor to merit from you, by training myself to kindness and justice, as well as firmness, in the defence of the truth. I remain truly yours,

ABSALOM PETERS.

Mr. Campbell promptly replied to the above, and has furnished a communication of which the following is the substance. Though the piece is quite too long, for the space we had proposed to allow, yet we insert the whole of it,

which has any application to the defence of Mr. Campbell against the alleged slanders, etc., contained in the article by Mr. Landis.

If an apology is required for devoting so much space to a defence so unsatisfactory as this may appear to be, the reader will find it in the considerations expressed in our letter to Mr. C. above. Our wish is to treat with perfect fairness every individual, whose doctrines are discussed in the Repository. No degree of rudeness on the part of a correspondent shall drive us from this determination.

Then, if one fails to secure the confidence of intelligent readers, or exhibits a spirit which incurs the disapprobation of wise and good men, the responsibility is his and not ours. After an introduction of some length, in the style of playful irony, Mr. C. proceeds as follows: [Editor.]

"Without further ceremony, and all raillery apart, I shall, with all gravity, commence my defence.

Narrative of the Case.

Personalities are no part of a literary, scientific, or theological Review, much less are they worthy of a place in a work of such reputation as that of the Am. Bib. Repository. I cannot, therefore, reply to the personal allusions found in the commencement of the article for January, 1839.* Mr. Landis knows as little of my personal history, as did that opponent from whom he borrowed those illiberal and unfounded allegations. When next he writes the memoirs of a living friend, I would advise him not to collect his facts and documents from the imagination of a fallen antagonist.

It is now almost thirty years since, in the capacity of a public teacher of faith and righteousness, I lifted up my feeble voice in favor of the *Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing*

* One would have supposed from Mr. Campbell's letter, that a principal object of his proposed defence was to meet and refute these "personal allusions." These, we presumed, were among the principal "slanders" of which he complained. By recurring to them, the reader will perceive that they are something more than mere "allusions." They are substantial statements; and while they remain, Mr. C.'s Defence must be regarded as unsatisfactory in a material point.—Editor.

but the Bible, as the only divine and necessary standard of Christian faith and manners. To suppose that it is not an adequate and an all-sufficient rule of faith, manners, doctrine, discipline, and church policy, then appeared, and yet appears to me, an argument against its Divine inspiration and authority. On a candid and faithful examination of the history of religious controversies and parties, it appeared that the era of creeds was the era of confirmed partyism ; that those human expedients, instead of uniting, reconciling, and healing divisions, have always either created or perpetuated them ; that the making or adopting of a creed had always stereotyped one party and occasioned another. So deposed to me all the pages of church history, from the Nicene creed to that of Westminster.

The position which myself, and others with me, were conscientiously, benevolently, and in the fear of God, compelled to assume, as every one knows, is an invidious one ; and necessarily provoked a degree of hostility and opposition, not only from our Presbyterian brethren and friends, but also from all parties. As we succeeded in making an impression in favor of these views, opposition arose, the controversy spread, and the *crescit eundo* of the poet became as apposite as ever. Still, we carried in our hands the olive branch of Christian peace to all who sincerely loved our common Lord and Saviour, and were always willing to unite with them on the broad and catholic principles of the ancient and primitive institution of Christ.

Our hostility to human creeds, however, had this peculiarity : while most persons oppose creeds because *they* oppose *them*, our opposition arose not so much from objections to their doctrine as their dogmas ; and a conviction of their divisive and schismatical tendencies. They appeared to us a collection of metaphysical, abstruse, and speculative opinions, rather than articles of belief, or rules of righteousness, adapted to the capacity of Christian communities ; and, in a certain degree, they seemed to supplant the Scriptures of truth in the esteem, affections, and meditations of professors. But we argue not the case, we only state it.

In lieu of them, we agreed to call Bible things by Bible names ; to use sacred terms and phrases, rather than human definitions ; to adhere rigidly to the Apostolic style ; to found communities upon the acknowledged facts, precepts,

and promises, of the BOOK, and to bear with one another in all matters of mere opinion or doubtful disputation; to walk by the same rules, and mind the same Divine things. On this ground we commenced our career, resolved to reject from our faith and manners every thing for which we could not find an unequivocal warrant in the Sacred Scriptures. We have, moreover, found less trouble in explaining our Divine creed, than we formerly experienced, and now see others experiencing, in their attempts orally to explain their written abstracts of revealed truth.

This stand and profession, as already intimated, called out a very formidable opposition, and resulted in a long-protracted controversy, in which I have borne a very prominent part (well sustained, indeed, by many others) for almost a quarter of a century. The clergy of all parties have occasionally taken a hand in it; and every inch of our path, from the beginning to the present hour, has been contested with great spirit, insomuch that every principle, rule of interpretation, doctrine, and system of operations recommended by us, has been subjected to a very strict and severe examination.

At the commencement of our editorial career, observing that God had placed one ear on each side of the head, while all partisan leaders sought to place them both on one side, we resolved to give to our readers both sides of every controversy, that they might for themselves judge the *pro* and the *con*. We have faithfully pursued this course for many years, as far as our pages would allow us; and the consequence has been not only a more thorough examination, but a much deeper conviction of the truth of the great points in issue. An unexpected, and, indeed, in these days an unprecedented success has attended our humble and imperfect efforts, and many, myriads of the excellent of the earth, of all parties (we bless the Lord), have united with us on the high and holy ground of apostolic precept and authority, so that hundreds of churches all over these United States, and some in Great Britain and her colonies, have been formed on the ancient platform.*

As a ship at sea, by distress of tempests, is sometimes

* This boasting of numbers was very appropriately noticed by Mr. Landis, in his article referred to, p. 95.—EDITOR.

driven from its proper course, so this controversy in its progress has, by the untoward force of circumstances, occasionally been forced from its legitimate and wonted channels. For while contending for facts, precepts, and promises—against all theories and speculations; while arguing for one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one spirit, one hope, one God and Father of all, as the proper foundation of Christian union, communion and co-operation, and while pleading for a reformation of manners; for more of the good fruits of the Spirit of our God in all holiness and righteousness, rather than for a new suit of opinions—our opponents, by imputing to us heterodoxy in this point, and error in that, have compelled us, once and again, to enter the lists with them in self-defence. For, in truth, almost every obnoxious principle, every upopular dogma, has been, in time past, imputed to us. And thus the fortunes of the old reformers are so far ours. Of Paul it was affirmed that he said, "Let us do evil that good may come." And of Luther it was alleged that "he had formed a league with the devil to banish religion out of Germany and the world."

Through this fiery ordeal, however, we have passed unscathed, even in the esteem of many, the most orthodox and godly in the land. For although no one party of those called *Evangelical* entertain all our views, and none of them observe the same order of worship in their assemblies, yet we find every important view that we entertain, every leading doctrine, ordinance, and practice, for which we contend, admitted, or taught, or practised, by some of these protestant *Evangelicals.* Hence, we conclude, that if these parties possessing and professing, in part, our views and practices, forfeit not their evangelical reputation, neither ought we for possessing and professing in the aggregate the various items by them admitted, as necessary to the perfection of Christian character.*

After this very summary statement of the case, our readers will be able to understand more correctly our defence

* This conclusion strikes us as by no means legitimate. The "aggregate," here spoken of, may be an aggregate of errors. If so, Mr. C. will in vain attempt to make it appear that a part is equal to the whole in its influence on the evangelical reputation of his sect.—EDITOR.

from the misconceptions and misrepresentations of Mr. Landis. And certainly, Mr. Editor, you have decided justly and correctly, that if our humble efforts and their success have rendered it either necessary or expedient that our views should appear in the Repository, it will be acceptable to all your readers to have an accurate and true representation of them in all those points upon which we have been assailed upon its pages.

I could have wished, indeed, that some competent person of your own party—who had not, like Mr. Landis, been engaged, in former years, in controversy with me, or my brethren, on these subjects—some impartial, honorable, and veritable gentleman had been at pains to have examined our works, and made a faithful and full report of our views for your pages. In that case, myself and brethren would have been satisfied, and a reply on my part would have been as unnecessary, as it is now disagreeable to me to appear in defence against the most jaundiced and distorted view of my sentiments and writings that has hitherto appeared.

In the very few pages allotted me, I shall not aim at a review of all that Mr. Landis has written; this I have more fully accomplished on my own pages already. I shall rather aim at a simple and intelligible statement of the views and actions on which he has so severely animadverted. Without acrimony, or any other feeling than that of benevolence, I shall pursue the plan which Mr. Landis has sketched for me in his review, and take up, in his own order, the points which, from an alleged thorough examination of my writings, he has selected as displaying what he is pleased to call,—"essentially another gospel,"—and as proving "that the Mormons have quite as valid claims to be regarded Christians, as Mr. Campbell himself and his followers." His chapters are four: 1st, On Faith. 2d, The Doctrines of Campbellism on Regeneration. 3d, "Unitarianism of the Campbellites." 4th, "The translation of the New Testament adopted by the Campbellites."

1*st. On Faith.*

"In Mr. Campbell's narrative," says Mr. Landis, "of the debate between him and the late Mr. Jennings, of Nashville, he asserts that faith, ranked among the fruits of the Spirit, is

fidelity." Mill. Harbinger, Vol. 3, p. 100, misquoted from Extra No. 1.

This is my first and fundamental error—the most fundamental of the "principles of Campbellism." We do indeed plead guilty to this charge. It is a true bill. *Faith*, in Gal. v. 22, as in Matth. xxiii. 23, and Titus ii. 10, ought to be translated "*fidelity*." The word is the same in these three passages, viz. πιστις. "The weightier matters of the law are righteousness, temperance, *fidelity*." Matth. xxii. 23, "The fruits of the Spirit are goodness, fidelity, meekness, temperance," and "showing all good *fidelity* to their masters." Titus ii. 10. The king's version has *fidelity* in the last, and *faith* in the former two. Now it so happens that this radical error of "Campbellism" has been adopted by the good Presbyterian continuators of Matthew Henry's commentary. It is also the new version of Doctor McKnight. That faith frequently denotes fidelity, we have also the testimony of Parkhurst, Greenfield, Campbell, even the king's translators themselves, who so render it, Titus ii. 10. The American and English Episcopalians are, with many Presbyterian doctors, guilty of this fundamental sin of "Campbellism;" for with D'Oyley and Mants, they place fidelity or faith among the fruits of the Spirit, Gal. v. 22. Yes, and I fearlessly appeal to the Andover school itself, that I am right in translating πιστις *fidelity* in Matth. xxii. 23, and in Gal. v. 22, according to all their canons of interpretation. This fundamental error of Campbellism is, indeed, the common error of *ninety-nine hundredths* of the most learned and intelligent Christians on earth. But might not common sense itself perceive, that when Jesus associates righteousness and temperance with *faith*, and calls them "the weightier matters of the law," he means not a mere principle but a moral virtue? And that when Paul associates faith, in the passage in debate, with "goodness, meekness, and temperance, against which there is no law," he means not a mere favor bestowed, but a moral virtue, sister to meekness and temperance!

But to the 2d proof of "the fundamental error of Campbellism." It is in these words:—"His fundamental position in relation to the faith which the gospel requires, or that belief which is to the saving of the soul, is, that it is '*in its nature purely historical*, consisting in the belief of a few simple facts, and not doctrines; that there neither was, nor could

there possibly be any difference between that belief of the gospel which is requisite to the salvation of the soul, and that credence which we usually with readiness yield to any other well authenticated history.' Vide Debate, p.p. 32—33, and ut supra."

The prejudices of my reviewer seem here to have effectually blinded his eyes, insomuch that he could not distinguish my words from those of a weak and prejudiced opponent. I answer this proof of my error and its illustration by simply affirming, that Mr. Landis has imposed upon his readers by putting into my mouth words which I never uttered, and which he can nowhere show in my writings.

But in the third place, he quotes the Christian Baptist, Vol. iii. No. 7, the substance of which he gives in the following words:—"Mr. Campbell asserts, that to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, is to believe on him to the saving of the soul." "It is not possible," says he, "to misunderstand this." Very good. What does it mean? Let an apostle pronounce sentence on these words. John the apostle affirms, *Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ* (the Messiah) *is born* of God." Surely then, he has true faith! But he does not say that 'every one who *thinks* he believes' nor 'every one that *professes to believe*,' but "every one that *does believe* that Jesus is the Messiah, is begotten of God."

Again in the same epistle, chap. v., John affirms that "this is the victory that overcomes the world, even our faith;" and in the next verse defines this faith, saying, "Who is he that overcomes the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?"

Mr. Landis has not, however, done me justice in saying that "Mr. Campbell asserts that to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, is to believe *on him* to the saving of the soul." He is too indiscriminating a reader of my works, to be depended on in his quotations or comments. Had he carefully examined my writings on this subject he would have found me making this distinction:—"To believe a person and believe *on* him are not always identical expressions. The one is sometimes the cause, the other the effect. One must believe Jesus before he can believe on him." The demons believed Jesus, but could not believe on him, because he did not profess to be their Saviour. Sin-

ners, however, amongst us, who believe all that Jesus says to them, will, I rejoice to say, believe on him.

I reason upon faith, as I do upon every thing else. Faith is something. It is an *effect* and has a cause. But the cause of faith, as well as the effect of faith upon us, are very different from faith itself. What then is faith? *Confidence in testimony, a persuasion that it is true.* It is never more nor less than the assurance that testimony is true. But if that testimony concern a person who professes to save us from sin, it is impossible to believe that testimony, without confiding in him, to the full amount of the testimony concerning him. May we not then say, that as respects faith religion is a *personal* thing? Subject and object! It is a person trusting in a person, loving a person, admiring, adoring, obeying a person. The special faith of the New Institution is—belief in the testimony of God concerning his Son; —in the testimony of the Son concerning himself; and in the testimony of the Holy Spirit, in the apostle's speaking of the Father and the Son in reference to the complete and eternal salvation of man from sin and all its penal consequences.

Many, indeed, *say* they have faith in him, whom I cannot believe,—because the world overcomes them: whereas he who believes on Jesus "overcomes the world." Saving faith, or faith unfeigned, with me, is confidence, faith, or trust in Jesus of Nazareth as the Son of God, the all-sufficient Saviour of sinners.

The next quotation from my writings (and on such an occasion I answer only for my views as I have expressed them) is the following: "In his Preface to his New Testament Mr. Campbell repeats this view: 'When one question of fact is answered in the affirmative, the way of happiness is laid open, and all doubts on the nature of true piety and humanity are dissipated. The fact is a historic one, and this question is of the same nature. It is this—*Was Jesus the Nazarene the Son and Apostle of God?* This question is capable of being converted into various forms—such as, Are the subsequent narratives true? Did Jesus actually and literally rise from the dead after being crucified and interred? Did he ascend into heaven in the presence of his disciples? Is he constituted the Judge of the living and the dead? or was he an impostor and a deceiver of men? It may be proposed in many a form; but it is still a unit, and

amounts to this—Is Jesus the Nazarene the Son of God, the Apostle of the Father, the Saviour of men? When this question is answered in the affirmative, our duty, our salvation, and our happiness are ascertained and determined.' Mill. Harb. Vol. vi. p. 82."

To this I fully subscribe; and the person that does not, has need to examine himself whether he be in the faith, or whether he believes on the Son of God; for surely if any one believes on him he will believe what he says, and what his apostles have said. And so explicit is Paul on this subject, that he simplifies still farther, and affirms that, "if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, *thou shalt* be saved."

He next proceeds to my second fundamental error—"The doctrine of Campbell on regeneration." The doctrine he expresses as follows:

"With one consent the Campbellites declare that regeneration, or being born again, is essential to salvation."

"Mr. Campbell and his friends declare that immersion in water is essential to regeneration."

"Mr. Campbell and his friends teach that immersion in water is absolutely essential to forgiveness of sins."

"The Campbellites declare that immersion in water and regeneration are two names for the same thing."

Under these allegations some words of mine and other persons, found in my volumes, frequently dislocated, and never taken in their connexion, are offered as proof. Three of the four propositions are truly and properly false and delusive. * The last, though not in form false and perverted, is made so by its connexion with the others, and the main

---

* If the reader will recur to Mr. Landis' article, p. 99, seq. he will find the foregoing propositions fully illustrated and fastened upon Mr. Campbell by ample quotations from his writings and publications. This defence, therefore, strikes us as an evasion of the points at issue, and we think every intelligent reader will see that Mr. C. has much more reason to *confess*, than to *complain* of, the want of candor. And we cannot see that his following remarks on his definition of the words "salvation," etc., relieve him in any measure from the point of Mr. Landis' statements.—EDITOR.

drift of the meaning attached to one of the terms in it. Oh! for a little of that candor and charity so often commended, but so seldom exhibited from the pulpit and religious press of this backsliding age! Had Mr. Landis given my definition of the word "*salvation*," and of the word "*regeneration*," or of "*washing* of *regeneration*," it would have saved him and myself some trouble, and his readers much imposition and deception.

Salvation, with me, is either temporal, spiritual or eternal. I have, times without number, affirmed my conviction that many will be found in heaven who never believed, repented, or were baptized. Often have we spoken of the salvation of our persons from the physical evils of this life—of our souls from the guilt, the pollution, and the power of sin; and of the salvation of our bodies from the grave—of our eternal redemption from every vestige of the consequences of moral evil. And having defined these three unequivocal acceptations of that term, I have been careful to a fault to show in which of these acceptations it is connected with baptism or regeneration.

All this is here passed over as though Mr. Landis knew nothing about it, and as if I used the word *salvation* in its popular meaning. A single passage from my writings would have made my meaning not only evident, but acceptable to all intelligent Protestants. It is a passage to be found under date of July 5, 1830, in my first Extra on remission of sins:

"We enter the kingdom of nature by being born of the flesh; we enter the kingdom of heaven, or come under the reign of Jesus Christ, in this life, by being born of water and the Spirit; we enter the kingdom of eternal glory by being born again from the earth, and neither by faith nor the first generation; neither by faith nor baptism, but by being counted worthy of the resurrection of the just.—'I was hungry and you fed me'—not because you believed, or were born of water; but because 'I was hungry and you fed me,' etc.

"There are three births, three kingdoms, and three salvations. One from the womb of our first mother, one from the water, and one from the grave. We enter a new world on, and not before, each birth:—the present animal life, at the first birth; the spiritual, or the life of God in our souls,

at the second birth; and the life eternal in the presence of God, at the third birth. And he who dreams of entering the second kingdom, or coming under the dominion of Jesus, without the second birth, may, to complete his error, dream of entering the kingdom of glory without a resurrection from the dead!

"Grace precedes all these births—shines in all these kingdoms; but will be glorified in the third. Sense is the principle of action in the first kingdom; faith, in the second; and sight spiritual, in the third.

"The first salvation is that of the body from the dangers and ills of life, and God is thus the 'Saviour of all men;' the second salvation is that of the soul from sin; the third is that of both soul and body united, delivered from moral and natural corruption, and introduced into the presence of God, where God shall be all in all."*

"Regeneration literally indicates the whole process of new-creating man. This process may consist of numerous distinct acts; but it is in accordance with general usage to give to the beginning, or consummating act, the name of the whole process. For the most part, however, the name of the whole process is given to the consummating act, because the process is always supposed incomplete until that act is performed. For example: in the process of tanning, fulling, forging, etc., the subject of these operations is not supposed to be tanned, fulled, forged, until the last act is performed. So in all the processes of nature. In the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms, the last act consummates the process. In the style of our American husbandmen, no crop nor animal is *made* until it come to maturity. We often hear them say of a good shower, or of a few clear days, 'This is the *making* of the wheat, or corn.' In the same sense it is that most Christians call *regeneration* THE NEW BIRTH; though *being born* is the last act in natural generation, and the last act in regeneration.

"In this way the *new birth* and *regeneration* are used indiscriminately by commentators and writers on theology; and by a figure of speech it is justified on well established principles of rhetoric.

"By the '*bath of regeneration*' is not meant the first, se-

* Christianity Resolved, p. 239.

cond, or third act; but the last act of regeneration, which completes the whole, and is therefore used to denote the new birth. This is the reason why our Lord and the apostle unite this act with water. Being *born of water*, in the Saviour's style, and the *bath of regeneration*, in the apostle's style, in the judgment of all writers and critics of eminence, refer to one and the same act, viz. Christian baptism. Hence it came to pass, that *all the ancients* (as fully proved in our first Extra on Remission) used the word *regeneration* as synonymous in signification with *immersion*." *

* * * * * *

Another extract on the *New Birth* from the same essay, will farther manifest the great injustice done my views by the garbled extracts and corollaries of my too sanguine reviewer.

"We have already seen that the consummation of the process of regeneration, or creation, is in the birth of the creature formed. So is it in the moral generation, or in the great process of regeneration. There is a state of existence from which he that is born passes; and there is a state of existence into which he enters at birth. Now the manner of existence, or the mode of life, is wholly changed; and he is, in reference to the former state, dead; and to the new state, alive. So in moral regeneration. The subject of this great change, before his new birth, existed in one state; but after it, he exists in another. He stands in a new relation to God, angels, and men. He is now born of God, and has the privilege of being a son of God, and is consequently pardoned, justified, sanctified, adopted, saved. The state which he left was a state of condemnation, which some call the 'state of nature.' The state into which he enters is a state of favor, in which he enjoys all the heavenly blessings through Christ: therefore it is called 'the kingdom of heaven.' All this is signified in his death, burial and resurrection with Christ, or in his being born of water. Hence the ne-

* The occasions of this usage among the fathers is explained by Pres. Beecher, in his article on Baptism, in our present No. p. 367. That this view of Baptism is contained in the Common Prayer Book of the Church of England, is no defence of Mr. Campbell. We therefore omit his quotation from that book in this place.—Editor.

cessity of being buried with Christ in water, that he may be born of water—that he may enjoy the renewal of the Holy Spirit, and be placed under the reign of Grace.

"*All the means of salvation are means of enjoyment—not of procurement.* Birth itself is not for procuring, but for enjoying the life possessed before birth. So in the figure—no one is to be baptized, or to be buried with Christ; no one is to be put under the water of regeneration for the purpose of *procuring* life, but for the purpose of *enjoying* the life of which he is possessed. If the child is never born, all its sensitive powers and faculties cannot be enjoyed; for it is after birth that these are fully developed, and feasted upon all the aliments and objects of sense in nature. Hence all that is now promised in the gospel can only be enjoyed by those who are born again and placed in the kingdom of heaven under all its influences. Hence the philosophy of that necessity which Jesus preached—'Unless a man be born again he cannot discern the kingdom of heaven'—'unless a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into it.' "But let no man think that in the act of being born, either naturally or metaphorically, the child purchases, procures, or merits either life or its enjoyments. He is only by his birth placed in circumstances favorable to the enjoyment of life, and all that makes life a blessing. 'To as many as received him, believing in his name, he granted the privilege of being children of God, who derive not their birth from blood, nor from the desire of the flesh, nor from the will of man, but from God." *

I am no less travestied and caricatured—no less misrepresented on the subject of remission of sins as connected with baptism, than on the subject of baptism as connected with the whole process of regeneration. "Mr. Campbell and his friends teach that immersion in water is *absolutely* essential to forgiveness of sins." The most charitable construction I can put upon this, is that Mr. L. does not understand his own language, or select his terms with discrimination. *Absolutely essential* to forgiveness! This is equal to 'no baptism, no forgiveness' in time or to eternity, for man, woman, or child. I never formed, uttered, or wrote such an idea.

---

* Mill. Har. Vol. IV. p. 355.

Have I not repeatedly said, "neither faith, repentance, nor baptism is *absolutely essential* to the future and eternal salvation," for then infant salvation would be impossible? But faith, repentance, baptism, are necessary to our *present enjoyment* of the grace of God—to the present *assurance* and *enjoyment* of the remission of our sins and adoption into the family of God. "He that *believeth* and is *baptized* shall be *saved*."—"Repent and be *baptized* for the remission of sins."—"The like figure whereunto baptism doth also *now save us*."

Mr. Landis has given us a string of propositions, syllogisms, and corollaries that really confound me. Listen, reader, to a few of them:—

1. "The faith which the Campbellites contend for has, confessedly, no connection whatever with regeneration. They are truly separate." p. 109.

2. "Faith has no real connection with pardon." p. 109.

3. "Mr. Campbell repeatedly ridicules the idea of the agency of the third person of the Trinity, either in the exercise of saving faith or in regeneration." p. 109.

Never, Mr. Landis—no, never! Why should Mr. Landis have noticed a system so preposterous? Surely, it could not subsist one year. But hear him farther:—

"Infants, who die in infancy, are either lost, or, if saved, they are saved without being regenerated." p. 110.

On the two points of regeneration and remission, I have written two Extras, two full essays, which have been so definite and intelligible, at least, as to impart the same views to many thousands of all sects and persuasions; and of great variety of natural endowments, as well as educational prejudices. But never have I seen such a misconception of any two pieces as that matured and exhibited on the pages of the Biblical Repository.

To prevent, as I imagined, the charge of Neologism, or wanton innovation, and all mistake, too, about my meaning, I concluded the last edition of my Extra on Remission with the following collection of witnesses, most of whom have at sundry times before appeared in my writings. Ten confessions of faith, and eight of them Protestant, are summoned.*

* * * * * *

* The quotations here furnished by Mr. C., and which we omit, are from the Confessions of the Baptists, of Bohemia,

With these documents, now for years before the public, I leave it to the good sense of my readers to say, why should I be thus slandered for saying sometimes less, and never more, than has been said by the wisest and best portions of the Christian church, in her purest and most undegenerate days! We do go farther than the theory: we *practise* what we preach. This is our greatest *error* in this age of empty professions and idle speculations.

6. "All mankind, therefore, according to the Campbellites, who are not immersed, perish for ever." p. 111.

We cannot but thank Mr. Landis for this consummation of his ridicule. It caps the climax well, and renders a serious and grave refutation wholly unnecessary. Any one who can believe that we could teach, and tens of thousands believe such a doctrine, is not worthy of being rescued from such a voluntary delusion.*

We have not room for a formal consideration of his expositions of John 3: 5, Titus 3: 5, Acts 22: 18, Mark 18: 18, Acts 2: 38. We must refer the curious reader to our Review of his Review.†

After all, it is some consolation, and rather a singular incident, that Mr. Landis comes to the same conclusions with myself, so far as theory is concerned, even on the most obnoxious point—the indispensable necessity of baptism to remission, in certain cases. We shall hear him affirm his own theory and views in his own language. On Acts 2: 38, Mr. Landis writes:

"I have no objections to allow that in the case of the persons here spoken of, baptism may have been essential to

---

of Augsburg, of Saxony, of Wittemburgh, of Helvetia, of Sueveland, of the Westminster Assembly, of the Roman Catholic and Greek churches, also some passages from Calvin and Westley. But as Mr. Campbell renounces all creeds but the Bible, and as he has not told which of these varying creeds on the point before us he would adopt as his own, we cannot see how their quotation here avails any thing in his defence. He will therefore excuse us for omitting them.—EDITOR.

* An easy way this of answering an alleged slander. We advise the reader to examine Mr. Landis' grounds for the assertion here referred to.—EDITOR.

† Mill. Harbinger, Vol. III.

remission; and yet this case would afford no ground for concluding that baptism is essential to remission *in every case.* But unless this can be shown, the passage confessedly affords no support whatever to the system. A few remarks will show how peculiar were their circumstances.

1. "The persons here spoken of, must either have obeyed the command, and have been baptized, or have remained open and avowed enemies to the cause of Christ.

2. "It was the best possible, and in fact the only satisfactory evidence that they could then give, of their sincerity in renouncing Judaism and embracing Christianity. This step involved the loss of all things.

3. "*They*, circumstanced as they were, could not even *innocently* mistake, or misunderstand the command. The Apostles were present, and if any difficulty occurred it could be promptly obviated. Hence it was not even possible for them to be in error respecting their duty on the subject,

4. "They had ample time and opportunity to obey the command.

"Now to disobey under such circumstances, must argue an impenitent, unhumbled heart; and to the possessor of such a heart remission could not be granted. And, hence, baptism was essential to the remission of their sins." pp. 127, 128.

This is enough—and all I ask from any man on this subject. When any person can, then, say that he comes not within the purview of this particular instance of opening the gospel dispensation on Pentecost, I, with Mr. L., will say it is not his duty to be baptized. I believe that the four particulars above stated by Mr. L. are all very judicious; and when they all concur, I hold baptism to be essential even to everlasting salvation. But in the next paragraph Mr. L. exactly expresses my views.

"In the same sense that baptism was essential to the remission of sins in this case, it is also essential to remission at the present time, e. g. when it is admitted that baptism is positively enjoined on all the followers of Christ; and when there is time and opportunity to obey the command. Under these circumstances I do contend that no one can be in a salvable state while he lives in the open violation of this command. We have no more right, under these circum-

stances, to dispense with this than with any other acknowledged command of the Saviour." p. 128.

This is the Alpha and the Omega of all I have said and written on this subject. I ask no more. In whatever way Mr. Landis can defend this paragraph from all he has written upon the subject, in the same manner he can defend me. His defence is mine. Here, as on Mark 16: 16, we stand exactly on the same ground. Farther than this I have never gone. This is "Campbellism" in the superlative degree.

Calvin himself was too strong a Campbellite for me. On cutting open the leaves of his article on Baptism, (vol. 2, p. 424,) since writing the preceding, I perceive that he is not only with me, but even before me and Mr. Landis in his views of baptism as connected with immersion. Hear him—*

* * * * * * *

The sum of the whole matter, as taught by us, on the whole subject of faith, repentance, baptism, etc., is as follows:

1. The Spirit of God, in the prophets and in the apostles, has borne ample testimony to the person, office, and character of Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah, the Son of God. It also confirmed the testimony which it gave: "God himself bearing witness, both by signs and wonders, and divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to his own will." Hence, the Spirit, in and by the word, *and never without it*, convicts the world of sin, righteousness and judgment, and in this way brings men to Christ.

2. The full and cordial persuasion and assurance of the testimony that God has given of his Son constitutes the belief or faith of the Gospel. This faith, though often preceded by much mental agitation, inward dread and horror, is the cause of that "repentance unto life," or change of heart, called (we think unscripturally) regeneration. This radical and thorough change of heart, this unequivocal repentance from dead works, only prepares a person for

---

* Here follows a long quotation from Calvin, which we omit for the reason before mentioned. It is irrelevant to Mr. Campbell's defence.—EDITOR.

Christian baptism; without which a sevenfold immersion in the Jordan would avail nothing.

3. For those, and those only, who thus believe in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the Blessed, and receive his death as the only reconciliation for iniquity, the basis of an everlasting justification—an end of all sin-offerings; all who hate sin and repent of it, baptism is a sign and a seal of the remission of all those "old sins," and to all such it certainly is a solemn pledge from God that all their former sins are washed away. And farther, we do not believe, nor teach, that any one can have the same assurance and pledge of forgiveness who does not believe, repent, and be baptized for the remission of sins. Else Peter preached to the Jews, and Ananias to Saul of Tarsus, an unmeaning ceremony, in language, too, deceptive in the highest degree. Should a person believe and repent of his sins, and, through any physical impossibility, fail in obtaining baptism, he would, as we teach, be received into the everlasting kingdom, upon the principle that God accepted the will and intention of Abraham for the deed, and never condemned any creature for not doing what it was not in his power to do.

4. In thus being born of water and of the Spirit, and constitutionally entering the kingdom of the Messiah in its present administration, all who are thus buried and raised with Christ in baptism, do receive the Spirit of God as a *Holy Guest* to abide in them. For this is the New Testament promise, as much as Christ was the Old Testament promise. Unless Wickliffe, Tyndall, and James's translators understood this, I know not by what singular good fortune it was that they gave us *Holy Ghost* so often in the New Testament and never once in the Old! Peter, indeed, taught the first converts that the Spirit of God who spoke in Joel was now to be the *Holy Guest* (as in Saxon import) of the Christian body, in all them who believed, repented, and were baptized, for the remission of their sins. This Divine Guest is both the sanctifier and comforter of all God's adopted children.

6. Eternal life—that most transcendent of all the gifts of God—the gift which comprehends all others, is promised to all born into the kingdom, who, "by a patient continuance in doing well," are seeking for glory, honor, and immortality. Such is that Gospel which we preach, which in his candid

and deliberate judgment Mr. Landis calls "another Gospel," and "no better than Mormonism."*

"*Unitarianism of the Campbellites.*"

It will require all the graces of the good Spirit to repel the charges preferred under this head and the following, concerning "The Translation of the New Testament adopted by the Campbellites," with the dignity and decorum of a follower of him who "when he was reviled, reviled not again." I will abstain from comments and epithets, and state a few facts, and leave it to every one to draw his own conclusions.

Mr. Landis explains himself in the following words: "I do not mean to be understood that every individual is either an avowed Arian or Socinian, *but that the majority are such.*" p. 305. Mr. Landis, then, testifies that the *majority* of those called Campbellites are "*avowed Arians or Socinians.*" A serious charge to prefer against a large community, of whom he speaks as probably amounting from 150 to 200,000 communicants, and presupposes a very conscientious and accurate examination of the profession. He does not inform us where he derived this information, or how he ascertained this majority. We should like to have been informed of the documents which authorized him to register before heaven and earth so serious and so defamatory an accusation.

Now, what is the proof which he brings?—Has he quoted one scrap of my writings in proof of the allegation that I am either an avowed Arian or Socinian? He has not. Has he quoted any passage on the subject of the relation of Father, Son, and Spirit, from my writings, (and I have often written on this subject,) from which he attempts even to infer my Unitarianism? He has not. Has he quoted from the writings of any leader, or, indeed, from any person in our com-

* This description, we presume, will hardly be recognised as embracing the *whole* of Campbellism. Surely it is not the whole system of which Mr. Landis speaks in the strong language here quoted. But we are truly glad to find Mr. C. now willing to disavow so many of the objectionable views which have appeared in his writings.—EDITOR.

munity, a single scrap indicative of Unitarianism, avowed or implied?* He has not. What then is his proof? He affirms that my "immediate followers" and those called "Chrystians" have united and formed one community, and that they are "avowed Arians or Socinians," and consequently we are equally Unitarian, because we fraternize with them. But this is not a fact. No such union has ever been formed. Certain preachers and congregations in the west, who were called "Chrystians," not however avowed "Arians nor Socinians," have united with us, on account of which the great mass of that people have disavowed them.

That any of them were "avowed Arians or Socinians," I have no evidence; but suppose them to have been by *construction*, Arian or Unitarian, (as I presume some of them were so regarded.) The union was formed on the ground of a disavowal of all such sentiments, speculations, and propositions; both parties disavowing Arianism, Unitarianism, Trinitarianism,† Sabellianism, and every human *ism* on the subject:—agreeing to use the sacred dialect in all their teachings, preachings, and writings, without any respect to these metaphysical abstractions, or private interpretations, calling Bible ideas by Bible names; and thus by speaking the same things in the same terms they expected to think the same things, and walk by the same rule.

Still there never was such a union as Mr. Landis affirms, and as proof of it we adduce the fact that the eastern "Chrystians," as a body, denounce us as Calvinists on this subject, and their quondam brethren in the west, who, in common with multitudes of Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists, have assented with us. Indeed, had Mr. Landis been only partially acquainted with our history, he would

---

* To all these questions the reader will find a satisfactory answer in Mr. Landis' article, p. 305, seq. We can only express our surprise that Mr. C. does not more justly appreciate the mass of evidence accumulated in that article.—Editor.

† Is this then the proof that Campbellites are not Unitarians; that they disavow both Unitarianism and *Trinitarianism?* Surely, Mr. Campbell needs no longer inquire for the documents which authorize the belief that he is not a Trinitarian. Then what is he?—Editor.

have found equal ground to have charged us with Catholicism, Episcopalianism Presbyterianism, Methodism, Deism, etc. etc., for of all these persuasions there have been accessions to our party.

Now I ask of what evidence it is to quote the writings of one Mr. Kincade, who never was one of us—whose writings I never read, never acknowledged, and, so far as known to me, are of no more authority among my brethren than Mr. Landis himself? Of what use, I ask, in all candor, reason, and truth, to quote the words of such a man to prove that the "majority of the Campbellites" are "avowed Arians or Socinians?"

Yet such is the only written evidence adduced in support of this most grave and damnatory allegation,—and, indeed, the only evidence, except some things which Mr. Landis *says* he heard from some preacher who *said* he was one of us; and yet he *said* nothing about our views on said subject; from which, if Mr. Landis' quotations are correct, any one could infer that we are "avowed Arians," &c. If this professed preacher of our views, to whom Mr. L. listened with such candor, is to be made a witness, although deposing nothing; I wonder, whether Mr. Landis would take my testimony, when I affirm, that *I know not one single individual avowed Arian or Socinian teacher or layman* in all our ranks, American or European? I again say not one.

But he says a certain Mr. Jamison compelled me to acknowledge that I "did not believe Jesus Christ to be the Supreme God!" What transcendent power of compulsion did this gentleman possess!

Thirty years ago I affirmed that an "eternal Son" presupposed an eternal Father; and that these two eternals were wholly incongruous and irreconcilable, and I now say, that to call "Jesus Christ the Supreme God" is not only unscriptural but unphilosophic and preposterous. Have we an inferior God! Is there supremacy and inferiority in Divinity!—If Mr. Jamison had asked me if I believed that "Jesus Christ was a *human* man," I should have given him the same answer. I know of no supreme Divinity or supreme humanity. Divinity and humanity, with me, have no degrees of comparison. If any being, or person, be divine, he is neither more nor less than divine; and in reference to him there is neither superior nor supreme divinity. But,

sir, a single quotation from my writings will show how much credit is due to such reviewers as Messrs. Jennings and Landis.—The following extract is seven years old, and therefore was not got up for an exigency like the present.

"I must be born again, and be endowed with other reasoning powers, and have another revelation, before I can become an Arian.

"I will give you one reason out of a hundred, and but one; because I feel that it alone, if I had not another, would for ever preclude the hypothesis: it is, in one sentence, because the Arian philosophy converts the wisdom of God into folly.

"If I am asked to explain how this can be, I refuse not. The Arian toils and sweats, and taxes his ingenuity to show what a glorious creature the Son of God was in his pre-existent state. He fancies and represents the Son as filling some intermediate rank, more than midway between the Arch Seraphim and the Deity. He thinks he devoutly consults the honor of the Son, when he finds for him some vacant throne, near to the Self-existent and Eternal, beyond the aspirations of the cherubim and seraphim. There he places him, a sort of sub-deity whence he descends to become incarnate. Yet, strange to tell, when this first and high-born One, of unrivalled glory amongst the creatures of God, appears in human flesh, *he gives him nothing to do, which the son of Joseph could not have done as well!!!* Was ever folly more consummate! What is folly, but the adoption of inadequate means to ends? Is it not folly to give a diamond for a straw?—to raise a tempest to move a feather?—to discharge the artillery of heaven against a worm?—to hurl the thunderbolts of Omnipotence against a fly?—to despatch the Archangel on an errand which the son of Joseph could have as well performed?

"What creature could do more than Abel, Moses, John the Baptist, Stephen, Peter, James the Just, or Paul did—tell the truth, the whole truth, lead an exemplary life, and as a martyr offer up his soul to God!*

---

* We cannot give our reasons in *extenso* for any of the more important conclusions suggested in these remarks. On this point we shall offer one. In our judgment it matters not whether we regard the sacrifice of Christ as a mere display of love, or as a sin-offering that God might be just in justifying

"What, let me again ask, is folly, if this be not folly? To waste resources, or squander means, is as foolish as not to provide them. He who provides the materials for a palace, and builds a cottage, is as very a simpleton as he who attempts to build a palace out of the materials of a tent. Could not Gabriel, who waited on Daniel on the bank of Ulai; nay, could not Paul himself, do as much for the redemption of the world, as the Arian Son of God? When some philosopher appears, who with a dash of his pen can blot out sin, or show me that the tears of the penitent, or the blood of bulls and goats can wash it from the universe, then, but not till then, will I turn Arian.

"For the same, or a similar reason, I cannot be a

---

him that believeth. On either hypothesis, the Arian or Socinian system is wholly at fault. For should we, with the Arian, imagine that Jesus, as to his pre-existent state, was a creature, however exalted, it avails nothing; because the distance between any creature and his Creator is so immense, (infinite I was going to say,) that all the creation might stand between, and yet no nearer approach to Deity. Now if Jesus never was, as to his celestial origin, more than a creature, he could, as a sin-offering, effect nothing more than any other creature: his life and death were all due to his Creator on his own account. Gabriel never can do more than his own duty. But on the other hypothesis, that his death was a mere display of love, in what, let me ask, does this love consist? To Omnipotence and Omniscience the creation of any one creature is as easy as another. It required no more, or greater effort, on the part of the *Almighty*, to create Gabriel than an eagle—this most illustrious creature than a sparrow; and how would the text read, "God so loved the world that he gave———for its redemption!!!" May I not infer, then, that the Arian philosophy converts the wisdom of God into folly? The Socinian, who calls Jesus *divine*, and some others who call him a *divine* person, because of the gifts of the Holy Spirit bestowed on him, might, in their interpretation of the word *divine*, find room for Balaam's ass; because that ass was under such plenary inspiration as to have the words suggested, and to speak with the gift of tongues, when it reproved the madness of the prophet, and preached reformation to him. Assuredly it was, in their vocabulary, a *divine* ass!"

Socinian. This is but a new edition of the fable—"the mountain's in labor, and a mouse is born."

Heaven-taught sages, legislators, kings, prophets, priests, and seers, for four thousand years, filled with the spirit of wisdom and revelation, exhaust all the similitudes, analogies, and imagery of this creation; impoverish the eloquence of heaven and earth, all figures and forms of speech, to raise the expectations of mankind in anticipation of a wonderful child, on whose shoulders the government of the universe was to remain, whose name was written, "Wonderful, Counsellor—the Mighty God—the Father of Eternity—the Prince of Peace—Immanuel;" yet when the prediction is accomplished, Mary travails, and the carpenter's son is born—a Son of God, it is true, as Adam was!!!

"With me, consistency must precede faith. I must see types, figures, prophecies, promises, harmonizing; I must see the means and the end correspondent; I must see wisdom, power, goodness, justice, mercy, love, condescension, truth, and holiness, shining in all the splendors of Divinity, before I can subscribe to any proposition touching the personal dignity and standing of my Lord the King.

"It will not suffice to puzzle me with hard questions about how this can be, since my faith has in its infancy to master the master truth of revelation—to admit that God is *Jehovah*, or, that God was, and always is, the self-existent, immutable, and eternal, who never began to be; the eternal inhabitant of eternity. Believing this, I find no difficulty in believing that there was, and is, and evermore shall be, society and plurality—a literal *I*, and *thou*, and *he*—a *we*, and *our*, and *us*, in *one divine nature*. This to me is as easy as the idea of *self-existent;* yea, more easy, when *I*, and *thou*, and *he*, deliberate on creation, providence, and redemption. I cannot, for my life, even fancy a nature destitute of *I*, and *thou*, and *he*. I am certain it is not the human—I am certain it is not the angelic--certain, too, that it is not the Divine.

"In our nature there is no more than I, and thou, and he, as respects primary relation. There is no more in the angelic, and the Bible reveals no more than I, and thou, and he, in the Divine. But not turning aside to answer objections which are anticipated, be it observed that I make not this a matter of inference only; for there is an association of the name of the Father, of the Son, and the Holy Spirit

in the revealed relation of the three persons, I, thou, and he, and just in the dignity of these three. 'I send thee;' 'I and thou send him;' 'Jehovah and his Spirit has sent me.' On this principle the Christian economy is arranged and developed.* So I read the volumes of revelation."

Yet with all this, and much more as explicit before him, my charitable and impartial reviewer asks: "Can any one doubt whether Mr. Campbell is to all intents and purposes an infidel under a Christian garb?" Page 306.

"*The Translation of the New Testament adopted by the Campbellites.*"

In the first place, there is no such translation on earth, unless it be that of King James, that which the Presbyterians have adopted. To that we make our first and last appeal in all cases of controversy, and neither preach nor teach any thing not found in it. Should I have called Campbell's and McKnight's versions the translation adopted by the Presbyterians, how much worse than an infidel would I have been! Yet this is just as true of them as it is of us. In our families and churches we read various translations, but have adopted none as *authoritative* except that used by all English and American Protestants. Several years since I published in one volume Campbell's Four Gospels, McKnight's Epistles, and Doddridge's Acts of Apostles and Apocalypse, and since that time have in later editions made numerous emendations. For which "bold, and daring, and awful" undertakings, Mr. Landis has distinguished me with some very courteous epithets and characteristics.

Much is said about a mistake which occurred on the title-page of the first edition of the new translation. Having always heard Jonathan Edwards, president of Princeton College, and Philip Doddridge, quoted, approved, and adopted as Presbyterian authorities, I placed Doddridge on the title-

---

* And yet Mr. C. affirms that the Campbellites disavow Trinitarianism as well as Unitarianism! The reader will not be surprised after this that Mr. Landis found it exceedingly difficult to ascertain the real doctrines of Campbellism. See his article, p. 99.—Editor.

page, with Campbell and McKnight, as Doctors of the Church of Scotland. I believed that they were communicants in common with all Presbyterian churches. Technically, however, it was an error. Still as the Congregationalists of New England were component parts of the Presbyterian Church of these United States until last year, and sat in their Assembly, I hold it to be according to their own usage to identify them as members of one ecclesiastic community. I, therefore, without the slightest suspicion of any umbrage to the Presbyterians, and without any conceivable interest or advantage to my views, had, as aforesaid, placed him on the title-page with the Presbyterians Campbell and McKnight, as members of the same church, much in the same way as they had placed Jonathan Edwards at the head of a Presbyterian College, as I supposed.

But why assail my motives and arraign my moral character for so doing? What gain or interest had I in this affair? Mr. Landis will tell you: "After Mr. Campbell had proclaimed Dr. Doddridge to be a Presbyterian, he cites him as an important and weighty authority, and one, of course, whose candor had got the better of his Presbyterian principles, to sustain the rendering which his book gives of *ekklesia*—viz. *congregation*, instead of that given in the common translations."

Let us now honestly examine this matter. We took but the Acts of the Apostles and the Apocalypse from Doddridge; the four Gospels from Campbell; and the Epistles from McKnight. We quoted Doddridge *once* in a critical note upon the word *ekklesia*, but we also gave Dr. Campbell in the same note, as sustaining the same view of the term, as also Thompson. I did not, indeed, at the time know the particular views of Doddridge on ecclesiastical government; I simply regarded him as a Calvinist whose works were every where read and commended by Presbyterians. As to any gain to my views from his remarks on *ekklesia*, I do not hold myself, or my readers indebted to him the millionth part of a grain. For, as my readers are often shown in my notes, I regarded Doddridge as of little or no critical authority; generally, if not always, preferring Drs. Campbell and McKnight to him, in passages which they had in common translated.

I had then, in fact, no motive nor temptation under heaven to assign Doddridge to any other branch of the church than that which he occupied. Nor is the New Version in the least indebted to his peculiar views of church polity for a single sentence that is not sustained by Presbyterian authority. After this candid statement of the matter, now listen to Mr. Landis: "In what estimation can the Christian public hold a man who will, for the sake of promoting the sale of a book, be guilty of such dissimulation?" I request the reader to ponder well upon the preceding question, with an especial reference, not only to the history I have given, but also in regard to Mr. Landis himself.*

In the same paragraph he says, "It was not until Mr. Campbell had published several large editions of this book, that he would consent to correct the false statement in its title-page, declaring Dr. Doddridge to be a member of the Church of Scotland." Now, with the above question and assertion in his eye, what will the reader think when informed that this is not so! *It was corrected in the second edition!*

But he proceeds to say—"As our examination must seriously affect the moral character of this gentleman, we invite attention to another point before we take up the subject directly." This shows what his calculations and intentions were. Now the point and drift of some three pages is to show that "corrections and improvements in style," *as alleged by us*, have been made in the original works of Campbell, McKnight and Doddridge, in our last editions of the New Version—"*yet still retaining its original title-page.*" This "retaining of the original title-page" he calls "a dishonest artifice"—"a crime in no way differing from actual forgery!" Two very serious charges against my moral character are here published to the world: enough to destroy the reputation of any man of any pretensions to Christian standing, or character. He first affirms as a solemn fact that for the sake of promoting the sale of a book, I knowingly and designedly retained a falsehood on its title-

* Before the reader makes up his mind in regard to the propriety of this question, he should by all means read Mr. Landis' account of the matter, p. 312, seq.—EDITOR.

page for "*several large editions.*"—And in the second place, *under the title of the first and second editions* I still published the work,—though changed and altered in numerous places. —Now certainly Mr. Landis would not have affirmed "*several editions*," "large editions," and "published under the same title," unless he had examined the affair: for who could imagine that such comprehensive and condemnatory accusations from such a quarter would be preferred without examination? Where, then, are his documents? where are the sources of his information? The case is of itself hard enough without any comments, and therefore I will only say—he has no such evidence, and that the whole three assertions—of *large* editions—and *several* editions, and "*under the same title*," are utterly false and unfounded. The books will show for themselves. The facts known and read of all men who choose to examine are:—1st. In the *Errata* to the 2d Ed. Dr. Doddridge is declared to have been a Congregationalist. In the second place, in the next edition, and in every subsequent one a NEW TITLE is affixed to the work—"*with Various Emendations*"—and additions of "Critical Notes on the Language, Geography, Chronology and History of the New Testament, and Miscellanous Tables, etc. By A. Campbell. 1832."

Mr. Landis next collects from my pocket edition of said Testament the *spurious readings*, which, on the authority of Griesbach and others, are rejected. He would fain impress his readers that Mr. Campbell "has followed in the steps of the Unitarian editors of the Improved Version."

After what has appeared, we are prepared for any thing. We have neither time nor necessity to justify a particular reference to these readings. I will only say, that there is not one spurious reading rejected from the common text that even squints to the pending controversies between the Trinitarians and Unitarians, that is not regarded as spurious by some of the most learned Trinitarians, living and dead, who have spoken of these things.

The motive of Mr. Landis to fix upon myself and the New Version an uncertain character, is so obvious that he who runs may read. His use, or rather abuse of the spurious readings enumerated in the appendix is dictated by this benevolent desire. He has, however, found that the table of spurious readings is larger than the actual excisions from

the text; a matter of which we may speak more fully at another time. Errors of this sort are found in all the Bibles in the land. Even in the single Epistle to the Romans, from the Andover Press; and after the most patient supervision of Professor Stuart himself, and that of the most accomplished proof-reader, an entire verse is left out; and, if I mistake not, it has not yet been noticed by any one of that school.* From whatever motive typographical omissions and errors are corrected, I am always glad. It is fortunate in this case that the omissions noticed by Mr. Landis are all in favor of the common version.†

On the subject of spurious readings, Mr. L. is manifestly not the most competent authority in the world. He has yet to learn that while we have a standard royal translation, there is no standard royal original. The common version is not according to any one ancient manuscript—is not according to any standard or received original in the world. It is a translation of a patch-work original. "It is," says one deeply learned in biblical criticism—a truly enlightened man on such questions—"it is a very singular anomaly, that, although we have, by public authority, a standard English version, yet there exists no standard Greek text for the *original of that version.* No principal printed editions of the Greek correspond exactly throughout, and none of them have been printed *verbatim* from any ancient manuscript, but each has been varied by critical alterations of its learned editor, on his own responsibility; on which account all the great collators of manuscripts have judged it necessary to apprize their readers, in the first instance, by what particular printed edition they have made their respec-

---

* As Mr. C. does not inform us what verse is here referred to, the reader will of course wait for proof of the correctness of his assertion.—Editor.

† The reader will find on recurring to Mr. Landis' article, that, in respect to the translation referred to, Mr. C. has failed to meet the most important points on which his work has been exposed to censure. The statements of Mr. L., then, appear to us to remain not materially affected by the reply of Mr. Campbell, and the translation must continue to be regarded as it has been since it was exposed on our pages.—Editor.

tive collations. Thus Birch states, *in limine*, that he collated by *Stephen's* 3d edition, 1550; Bentley's collations were made by the text of Erasmus, 3d edition, 1522, as reprinted at Strasburgh in 1724, by W. Cephalæus. Other collators have also specified the editions by which they compared. One of the most ardent defenders of the common version, and much more learned than Mr. Landis, has been constrained to admit this fact in "The British Critic and Quarterly Theological Review, and Ecclesiastical Record."*

I am, indeed, of opinion, to use with approbation the words of Mr. Landis, that "all the alterations contended for do not affect, either *pro* or *con*, one single article of the Christian system." I have gone farther: I have said that I never saw any version or translation of the Christian Scriptures, Latin, German, French, or English,—Romanist or Protestant—ancient or modern, from which any honest man of plain common sense might not learn the way to heaven, to holiness and happiness, with unerring certainty; if he applied his mind to it. They all name the same persons, places, and events—record the same facts—narrate the same parables, comparisons, conversations, and deliver the same precepts and promises. They may, indeed, differ much in their plainness, perspicuity, and easy intelligence; but the same story is told in all its characteristics, attributes, and circumstances. Like different witnesses, whose testimony exactly agrees in all the facts, even to the most minute, A, B, C, and D, has each his own way of telling it to the court and jury; but there is one of them whose perspicuity and precision make his testimony more intelligible and comprehensible than that of all the others. So in translations: one may greatly excel another in all the attributes of clearness, simplicity, and general intelligibility.

But as I have been permitted thus briefly to disabuse the readers of the Repository of the false impressions, touching both my views and my character, through which they must always have contemplated them and me, had they no other source of information than that furnished them by Mr. Landis, I do not wish further to trespass on your time by a more formal and elaborate exposition of all that Mr. Landis

---

* London, July 1837, No. 43.

has spread over seventy of your pages concerning me. The four corners of his superstructure have been now tested, and every one can judge of what materials they were constructed. *

* Mr. C. adds a few sentences commending his "Millenial Harbinger" to our readers as containing "a more full, pointed, and spirited review," also, administering some personal advice to Mr. Landis, and then closes his communication "with sentiments of benevolence for all mankind," and friendly salutations to ourselves. These passages we omit, for reasons before stated. They have no bearing upon Mr. Campbell's defence; and our sole object in having admitted this article, is that he may no longer have any occasion to complain of injustice from us. We trust that both he and our readers will be satisfied with the manner in which we have presented his communication, and that we shall be excused, under the circumstances of the case, for having occupied so large a space with a defence so generally personal. We trust we shall not often have occasion thus to tax the patience of our readers.—EDITOR.

ARTICLE XII.

Critical Notices.

1.—*Notes: Critical, Explanatory, and Practical, on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah; with a New Translation, by Albert Barnes. In three volumes.* 8vo. Boston, Crocker & Brewster; New-York, Jonathan Leavitt. 1840, pp. 517, 438, 770.

"Probably no book of the Bible has occupied so much the attention of critics, commentators, and private Christians, as Isaiah." Numerous authors have contributed to its illustration. Among these, the acute Calvin, the learned Vitringa, the elaborate Lowth, the glossarial Rosenmueller, the linguistic Gesenius, have each in their turn set forth the evangelical prophet with a copious furniture of translation and commentary. In later times a host of oriental travellers have shed their illustrative light, upon the obscurities of this book; and now Mr. Barnes comes forward with the fruits of his untiring industry, gleaned from over the whole harvest field of his predecessors.

This is, doubtless, the greatest work of Mr. Barnes' pen. It has been wrought amid the labors of a large parochial charge, and with a diligence rarely equalled, during a period of more than four years. It now comes to us in three stately octavos, constituting, we believe, the largest mass of commentary on the '*Fifth Evangelist*,' to be found in our language.

The author's excellencies, if not his defects, are strongly marked through the work. The style is plain, simple, and direct, and though his pages teem with the *materiel* of deep scholarship, yet he is, for the most part, eminently happy in making himself intelligible and interesting to every class; while the rich practical remarks, every now and then grafted upon the critical details, transfuse the devotional spirit of the writer into the bosom of his reader.

The chief abatement from Mr. Barnes' general merit, in this work, as perhaps also in his others, is the frequent recurrence of what may be termed *gratuitous annotation*. Hundreds of single phrases, of perfectly obvious import, which barely admit of equipollent terms, and do not *need* even them; are paragraphed, and paraded, in the style of formal exegesis,

though the effect upon the mind is often little else than that of *diluted paraphrase*. One consequence, of serious import, of this feature of the work, is, that it has unnecessarily swollen its bulk. We admit that in many cases a bright gleam of light is thrown upon a word or passage by a slight variation of the phrase, but quite as often the reader is forced to ask himself, whether he really does need to be remanded back to his rudiments quite so frequently as Mr. Barnes' notes would imply.

The general principles of interpretation, adopted by Mr. Barnes, are in accordance with the most generally approved results of Biblical study in modern times. He balances with commendable fairness between the *Cocceianism* of Vitringa, and the *Grotianism* of Gesenius. He gives full scope to the principle of the Messianic interpretation, at the same time that he sets his face as a flint against being led away by any merely fanciful analogies or forced adaptations. In spite, however, of this large and willing concession, we have been conscious of a certain unsatisfied feeling—an impression of meagerness and jejuneness—in following his annotations on some of the sublimest Messianic predictions. He does not give us, as fully as we could wish, the *particular* applications. Apparently adopting Hengstenberg's very questionable position, that the prophets beheld the glories of the Messiah's kingdom in *space* and not in *time*, that is, without a definite distinction of eras, he affords us comparatively little aid in weaving together into one harmonious tissue, the golden threads of the Old and New Testament oracles. On this score it may still be questioned, whether Vitringa does not bear away the palm from all later commentators. The light which to the eyes of German expositors merely floats in a brilliant halo around the summit of the 'delectable mountains' of the vision, Vitringa concentrates through the Apocalyptic lens, and makes it glow in a luminous focus upon *distinct points* of the great prophetic vista that Isaiah opens before us. In this respect Mr. Barnes' work does not fully meet our wishes. As a philological and exegetical digest, however, on the prince of the ancient prophets, it is a work of great value. It is a storehouse of rich illustrations of the letter of his author, and one from which the theological student may largely replenish his critical *adversaria*.

We do not especially admire the taste with which the text of the Old and New version has been arranged. But as this is a matter of mere mechanical moment, and as the work will receive its character from the Notes, we are not disposed to dwell upon it. We think, indeed, as every necessary emen-

dation of the present translation could have been suggested in the Notes, the new one might have been entirely dispensed with. If this retrenchment could have been made, together with a considerable subduction of superfluous comments, the work might have been compressed into a much smaller size, and thus the greatest objection to it, its inordinate dimensions, have been obviated. Voluminous as it is, however, its faults are few in comparison with its excellencies, and those who properly appreciate its value, will not long consent to dispense with its possession.

2.—*Manual of Classical Literature, from the German of J. J. Eschenburg, Professor in the Carolinum, at Brunswick, with additions, by N. W. Fiske, Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy (formerly of the Latin and Greek Languages) in Amherst College.* Philadelphia: Frederick W. Greenough. 1839, pp. 753.

Our readers will recollect that the Second Edition of this valuable work was reviewed in the Biblical Repository of April, 1837. The high terms, in which it was spoken of by the able and accomplished reviewer, have doubtless been responded to by every student, who has had access to the work. Of its due appreciation there is no better evidence, than the speedy demand which has been made for another Edition. The value of the present Edition is much enhanced by a new translation of the part of Eschenburg, relating to Roman authors, together with a large amount of original matter. Many valuable additions have also been made to other portions of the work. It has the additional value of being embellished with several hundred cuts, illustrative of the Literature and Art of the Greeks and Romans. We should judge, that the present Edition contains at least one fourth more of matter than the preceding one, and yet is printed so compactly as to be but very little increased in size.

This manual is a *thesaurus* to the student. There is scarcely a topic pertaining to Greek and Roman Archaeology, which cannot be found in it, with pertinent remarks and illustrations. It combines a luminous and well digested view of Archaeology, of Literature and Art; history of Ancient Literature, Greek and Roman; Mythology of the Greeks and Romans; Greek and Roman Antiquities; Classical Geography and Chronology. We know of no work, which can be compared with it, in the amount and value of the classical information it communicates.

It is a substantial aid, which we most heartily commend to every teacher, and student, as a table companion to lie beside his Lexicons and Grammars. A familiarity with such a work, through an academic and collegiate course, cannot fail to enrich the mind with a fund of classical knowledge, and impart additional zest to the study of the Greek and Roman authors. A long time has not elapsed, since a student would have been compelled to spend whole days, in a large and well selected library, to obtain the information, that is now presented to him, in one well arranged volume. Prof. Fiske deserves the thanks of every one, who is interested in the advancement of classical learning. The external appearance of the work is neat and attractive.

3.—*Aids to Reflection, by Samuel Taylor Coleridge, with a Preliminary Essay, by James Marsh, D. D. From the Fourth London Edition, with the Author's Last Corrections. Edited by Henry Nelson Coleridge, Esq. M. A.* New-York, Gould, Newman & Saxton. 1840, pp. 354. octavo.

Aids to Reflection, by Samuel Taylor Coleridge, with the Author's Last Corrections. Edited by Henry Nelson Coleridge, Esq. M. A.; to which is prefixed a Preliminary Essay, by John McVickar, D. D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, in Columbia College, New York. London, William Pickering; New York, Swords, Stanford & Co. 1839, 12 mo. pp. 324.

These two editions of Coleridge's "Aids to Reflection" are before the public with conflicting claims. It is with reluctance that we speak disparagingly of either; and yet the reasons urged by the Editor of the latter, for its publication, are such as render it impossible to commend the one without an implied censure of the other. In these circumstances we cannot hesitate to express our decided preference of that by Prof. Marsh. We are happily relieved, however, from the necessity of stating the grounds of this preference, by the following strictures on the edition by Prof. McVickar, furnished by a respected correspondent, who is not a disciple of Coleridge, but "as a friend of truth and fair dealing," claims to speak freely.

The publication of this new preliminary essay, by Dr. McVickar, will be unfortunate to the reputation of its author, for fairness of mind, for accuracy, we had almost said honesty, in

his statements and quotations, and we may add, for a manly and honorable spirit. It will be received with disapprobation, by all who are acquainted either with the merits of the essay for which it was substituted or with the principles and spirit of Coleridge himself.

The Essay of Dr. Marsh, had been read and approved by Mr. Coleridge, who was able, if any man is, to judge of its merits as a true exposition of his own system of Christian philosophy, and also of the importance of the suggestions which were designed to secure for it a faithful and unprejudiced study. It was also prefixed to the edition which was "recently put forth in London by his nephew and executor with the author's final amendments." None but reasons the most substantial and imperative could authorize or justify the opinion on the part of Prof. McVickar, that the essay of Dr. Marsh thus consecrated by the dying wishes of a man like Mr. Coleridge, was open to so many exceptions, as to demand a better.

The reasons given for this opinion, and for the attempt to substitute another introduction, are five. 1. "That such Preface is mainly occupied in justifying Coleridge and his philosophy, against objections which have no place except on the Calvinistic scheme of Divinity. But these obviously are difficulties in the way of the reception not of Coleridge's but of his commentator's opinions, objections therefore not with churchmen, but with dissenters from the church." On p. xxviii. he represents Dr. Marsh as laboring to reconcile his author with the Calvinism of Edwards, and adds, "to reconcile Coleridge with Calvinism, is that fruitless task which places him ever in a false position with regard to his own faith, and in a needless one in the light of all others." Allowing the fact here stated to be true, what then? Are there no Calvinists within the Church? Are there none who would be allowed by Prof. McVickar to be "called of God as was Aaron," who are yet Calvinistic in their views of Theology? Is a Calvinist of necessity not a Churchman but "a dissenter from the Church?"

Besides; this Stereotype Edition is not only addressed to that communion of which its author "was an affectionate and faithful son," but also "to the church at large," unless indeed the latter phrase was penned by its author in a moment of forgetful and inconsistent Catholicity; and surely the church at large might not suffer by an effort to justify the system held by Coleridge from objections on the score of Calvinism.

But the fact stated is not true; Dr. Marsh is not a Calvinist of the school of Edwards; and a large portion of his preliminary essay is an attempt to show that his views of the will, etc., are inconsistent with right reason and spiritual religion, and that the views of Coleridge are the only substitute. How any man could have thought or said the contrary, we can with difficulty understand.

Reason 2. "That it [i. e. the Preface] inculcates what is deemed a false and dangerous principle, viz. that some system of metaphysical philosophy is essential to soundness in Christian doctrine." To this we reply, that it inculcates no such thing—and nothing in the least inconsistent with the views of Coleridge himself. With Coleridge Dr. Marsh indeed teaches—"that we can have no right views of theology, till we have right views of the human mind." This his master taught with all his might; inculcating that there can be no consistent scheme of scientific theology, which is not founded on a right division of the powers of man, and a judgment thence derived, as to what man can and cannot know, in the way of science. To construct a scheme of *Christian philosophy* was the aim and aspiration of his later years.

In entire consistency with this great principle both teach—the one *as* the other, that Religion as distinguished from speculative Theology,—is not a speculation but a life, not a philosophy of life, but a life and living process. Prof. McVickar has here displayed a singular facility in misunderstanding both Dr. Marsh and Coleridge—as well as misquoting the latter.

Reason 3. "That it tends to a misapprehension of Coleridge's religious views, by identifying them with what among us," says Dr. Marsh, "are termed the evangelical doctrines."—"Now the term used as a party name, in which sense alone it can be here understood, is one peculiarly inappropriate as applied to Coleridge," etc.

The word Evangelical is not used here in a party sense—certainly not in *the* party sense in which it is quoted by Prof. McVickar. The phrase "the evangelical doctrines," is used by Dr. Marsh, as synonymous with the great truths of revelation which are held in common by those Christian denominations who are regarded as believers in serious and spiritual religion. It has nothing to do with opposing parties or opinions, in the English or American Episcopal Churches, respecting, "the church, the sin of schism, the doctrine of the sacraments, or conversion."

Reason 4, is, in substance, its unqualified eulogium of Cole-

ridge and his opinions. Dr. Marsh does not eulogize his author excessively—for we know that there are some of his peculiar opinions of men and things which he does not adopt. He did not however deem it necessary to state every point, in which he differed from him. This he regarded doubtless as too trivial an occupation for one who had at heart the furtherance of his principles of Christian truth—and not a bigoted or blind devotion to the foibles of the man.

"Lastly, it is rejected as being a preface which takes too much knowledge for granted, on the part of the reader, to answer the present demand of an edition fitted for popular use." Of this reason we can only say, that the man who has not sufficient knowledge to grapple with the essay of Dr. Marsh, need not expect to grapple successfully with Mr. Coleridge. If he is deterred by the introduction it is a sure indication that he had better remain a while, in the schools of ordinary teachers.

The truth of the matter is this: Coleridge was an Episcopalian—a devout and reverent son of the established church; therefore it was a thing to be desired that his work should be taken under the patronage of Episcopalians—and that his name should be turned to its account in promoting the extreme doctrines, that are now so fashionable on both sides of the Atlantic. Prof. McVickar and his associates can ill endure, that "a dissenting clergyman from Vermont," should have had the penetration to discern the high merits of this remarkable man, and the courage to avow his convictions, at a time when it cost some boldness to do so. They feel that a believer in a self-constituted ministry has no right to connect his name with an Episcopal author; and when they witness this outrage they feel not a little unlike the famous Dennis, when he cried, "How these rascals use me;—they will not let my play run, *yet they steal my thunder!*"

We deem it important to add a brief statement of the views of Coleridge in reference to the church, and especially those most offensive doctrines at large, with which the effort has been made to connect the authority of his name, in the pitiful spirit of sectarian partisanship.

Coleridge was a friend and a zealous supporter to the national church in England, and was vexed and grieved with the efforts of the modern dissenters to bring the establishment to an end. In the same spirit and for the same reasons, not a few in our own country were the avowed supporters of the more liberal establishments of Virginia and Connecticut—and this independently of the fact that Episcopacy was supported by the one and Congregationalism by the other.

He also held "that Christianity without a church [not visible church as Mr. McVickar quotes him], exercising spiritual authority, is vanity and dissolution." So did all the Reformers hold; so do the divines of the Lutheran and Reformed churches at the present day. Coleridge has no where said that "Christianity without a church episcopally constituted is vanity and dissolution," but has every where implied the contrary.*

He holds in regard to the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, what the Reformers held, not of the English or Episcopal church, but of the church of Scotland as well as those upon the Continent. If in this point he approximates to the opinions of the Oxford divines, it is no more than just that it should also be stated, that in their views and the views of Prof. McVickar respecting the administration of Whitgift and Bancroft, and Laud and the Puritan defection, he differs from them widely.

He was also an affectionate son of the English church as the church in which he was born and baptized, for the reason which Richter gives in his saying—"your church may be a very good church but she is not *my mother*."

He has no where avowed himself, the foe of "a self-constituted ministry," i. e. a ministry not episcopally ordained, and there is not a passage to be found in his writings from which there can be gathered the conclusion that he held the divine right of Episcopal ordination, and the Apostolical succession. From hundreds the opposite might be derived. Nothing would be more offensive or unpleasant to the high churchmen of the present day, than the even-handed justice which he metes out to the two parties in the great strife of Puritanism, and the high terms in which he speaks of those whom they load with contemptuous epithets.

Not to speak of the unfairness of the quotations made by Prof. McVickar—we must be content with requesting the reader to look them out for himself.

The writer of this notice is not a partisan of the philosophy of Coleridge, and would not be owned as one of his disciples. It is therefore with the greater freedom, that as a friend of truth and fair dealing, as well as of the high moral and intellectual worth of Prof. Marsh, he has made these strictures.

---

* In his book on the Church and State, which has never been reprinted in this country, he represents the Primitive Church as Congregational or Presbyterian.

4.—*New Work on Christian Antiquities.*

We are happy to hear that a new work on the subject of Christian Antiquities is in the course of preparation, by the Rev. Lyman Coleman, Principal of the Teachers' Seminary, Andover, Mass. Such a work has long been a desideratum. The treatise of Bingham is voluminous, not always the most impartial, and, in the present state of knowledge, imperfect. Bingham was very strongly attached to his own communion, and is, of course, apt to be prejudiced in its favor. The work of Mr. Coleman will be on the basis of that of Augusti, a distinguished professor in the university of Bonn. The original work of this venerable theologian was published in 12 volumes, 1817—1837. This was the result, according to his representations, of the study and industry of many years. It was very favorably received, not only in Germany, but in England, Holland, Denmark and Sweden. An abridgment of this work in three octavo volumes, by the author himself, has been published since the larger work was issued. The design of this compend was to satisfy the demands of the public for a work less voluminous and expensive, which should at the same time embody all the important facts relating to this subject. In the accomplishment of his task, the author pursued a middle course between an extended detail and a barren abstract. The whole ground in the abridgment, is carefully revised and improved. That part, however, which relates to the original organization of the church and to the priesthood, the author has, very judiciously, given entire. The treatise contains an elaborate account of those important points, together with an ample statement of the various rites of worship, the sacred seasons and festivals of the primitive church, their methods of celebrating the Lord's Supper—the subjects and mode of baptism, marriage and funeral ceremonies, etc. In a word, it comprehends the whole subject of ecclesiastical antiquities, in a clear, systematic and happy manner. If the translation and condensation is well done by Mr. Coleman, of which, from his sound judgment and well-known habits of accuracy and industry, we cannot doubt, the public will be put in possession of an invaluable work, almost equally interesting to the theological student, the minister and the antiquarian. Much will be found in it, also, to interest the general reader.

Augusti has been successively professor of theology at Jena, Breslau and Bonn. He is the author of many works, chiefly relating to Church History, and is deservedly regarded as one of the leading antiquarians of the age. In the Halle

Allgemeine Litteratur Zeitung, he is characterized as an "honored veteran," in this department of sacred literature. By occasional abridgments, and by the omission of such parts as may be least interesting to the American reader, it is thought that the work may be brought within one octavo volume.*

5.—*The Elements of Geology for Popular Use, containing a description of the Geological Formations and Mineral Resources of the United States. By Charles A. Lee, M. D. Late Prof. of Materia Medica and Medical Jurisprudence in the University of the City of New-York.* Harper and Brothers, 1839.

We have perused this work, which forms one of the volumes of Harpers' School District Library, with pleasure. Commencing with a short abstract of those laws and phenomena of Chemistry, a knowledge of which is necessary to the full understanding of the subsequent parts of the work, it is divided into two sections, the first containing a view of General Geology, and the second the Geology of the United States.

Though the book is avowedly intended for the use of the younger members of the community, it is not the less adapted to instruct maturer minds. It gives a good view of the actual state of the science, and is to a great extent free from those embarrassing technicalities and premature hypotheses, which deform so many other works on the same subject.

ARTICLE XIII.

RECENT LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Germany.

Two Editions of the entire Works of Plato are in the process of publication in Germany. One is under the charge of Prof. G. Stallbaum, of Leipsic. The first section of vol. viii., containing Theatætus, has just been published. It is accompanied with commentaries. The other Edition is edited by Baiter, Orelli and Winckelmann. Ast's Edition, with a complete apparatus of Notes, Lexicon and Indexes, has been for some time out of press. A zealous Platonist has arisen at Utrecht in Holland, Van Heusde, who has written largely and *con amore* on the subject.—The

---

* For further notices of Augusti's great work, see Am. Bib. Repos. Jan. 1839, pp. 253, 254.

15th (enlarged and amended) Edition of Buttmann's smaller Greek Grammar has been issued. One of the earlier Editions of this Grammar was translated by Gov. Everett.—Dr. Franklin's Life and Essays, with a Dictionary of the words employed, has appeared at Carlsruhe.—S. M. Ehrenberg has published at Berlin, a Practical Elementary Book, for the learning of the Hebrew Language —A new and excellent Edition of Locman's Fables in Arabic, has been edited by Prof. Roediger of Halle. It is accompanied with Critical Notes, and a Glossary. Prof. R. is one of the ablest Arabic scholars now living.—L. H. Löwenstein has published a new Edition of the Lamentations of Jeremiah, with a careful collation of MSS., both ancient and the more recent, accompanied with a metrical translation and with notes.—Perthes of Hamburgh, has issued a History of the Græco-Roman Philosophy, exhibited from the sources, by H. Ritter and L. Preller.—Prof. Ritter has published appendices and additions to the first four volumes of his History of Philosophy.—Prof. A. Schöll has brought out some contributions to the History of Greek Poesy.—A 3d Edition of Guerike's Manual of Church History has appeared; also the first section of F. Hitzig's brief exegetical Manual for the Old Testament; vol. 3. of Hengstenberg's Contributions to the Introduction to the Old Testament, on the authenticity of the Pentateuch; section 2d of Prof. Maurer's Grammatical, Critical and Historical Commentary on the Old Testament. This is a brief, judicious and valuable exegetical book for beginners in the reading of the Old Testament. As a grammatical assistant, it is much preferable to the ponderous volumes of Rosenmüller.—A new Edition of Münscher's Manual of Dogmatics, with references to the sources, historical notices, etc., edited, after the death of Von Cölln, a previous Editor, by C. G. Neudecker. An earlier Edition of this Manual was translated by Dr. Murdock of New-Haven.—A 3d Edition of Olshausen's Commentary on the Gospel of John has been published. The following volumes from the pen of Tholuck, are advertised:—2d Edition of the Credibility of the Gospel History, with a Criticism on the Life of Jesus, by Strauss. Miscellaneous Writings, chiefly of an apologetic character. "The Old Testament in the New, or the citations in the New Testament from the Old, and on the nature of the sacrifices and priesthood." De Wette has brought out a new Edition of his exegetical Manual of the New Testament; and Winer, a 3d Edition of his Manual of Theological Literature, with short biographical notices of the writers.—The learned Prof. Boeckh, of Berlin, has published a very valuable Essay, on the weights, measures, etc., of the ancients, in their mutual relations.—Lassen of Bonn, one of the principal orientalists of Germany, has published contributions to the History of the Greek and Indo-Scythian Kings of Bactria, Cabool, and India, by deciphering the ancient Cabool legends, which are found on their coins.—Dr. Julius of Hamburgh has published "the Moral Condition of North-America, from the author's observations, made in 1834-6.—Julius Fürst, author of the New Hebrew Concordance has been appointed Professor of Oriental Languages, in the University of Leipsic. He was nominated by the professors, and appointed by the king

of Saxony. He is a young man, and is said to be the first Jew, who has ever been named to a professorship in Germany.—Dr. Strauss, who was appointed to a professorship in Zurich in Switzerland, has been obliged to leave the post on account of the strong opposition which was made to him by the inhabitants of the Canton.

France.

The prince Alexander Labanoff, has published the hitherto inedited letters of Mary Stuart, accompanied by divers despatches and instructions. The 16th No. of Vol. I. of the Monuments of Egypt and Nubia, after the designs executed for them by Champollion the younger, etc., has been published under the auspices of Guizot and Thiers.—A Supplement to the Dictionary of the French Academy has been published under the direction of a member of the Academy, in 20 nos. 8vo.—M. G. Panthier, the Chinese scholar, has brought out an Essay on the origin and formation of the different systems of oriental and occidental writing.—The fifth section of Vol. III. of the new edition of Henry Stephens's Greek Thesaurus, under the charge of Hase and the two Dindorfs, has made its appearance. We are glad to notice a French Translation of Sparks' edition of the Writings of Washington, under the superintendence of Guizot. We may also mention that a selection from these writings, has been translated in Germany by Miss Tieck, daughter of the celebrated Tieck of Dresden. The version is furnished with a Preface by the historian Von Raumur of Berlin.

United States.

Dr. Webster, professor in Harvard University, is preparing a translation of some of the more celebrated eulogies which have been pronounced at Paris in honor of distinguished deceased Savans. A selection from these eulogies, with such notes as the translator may be able to supply, cannot but be useful. We understand that the Rev. Joseph B. Felt, of Boston, a learned and zealous antiquarian, will soon publish an ecclesiastical history of New-England. No man in the country, perhaps, is more familiar with the early Puritan annals.—We are also informed that the Rev. Dr. Allen, late President of Boudoin College, is engaged in preparing an "Ecclesiastical History of New England from its first settlement." Dr Allen is also familiar with the subjects of such a history, and his work may be a successful competitor with that of Mr. Felt. The translation of Dr. Wiggers's History of Augustinianism and Pelagianism, by Prof. Emerson of Andover, is in press, and will appear in the course of the Spring. It will be a rich accession to our Theological literature. We are glad to hear that Crocker & Brewster, of Boston, will put to press at an early day, a new Edition of Smith & Dwight's Tour in Armenia. It will probably be comprised in one volume 8vo. No book of Travels by Americans, has been better received by the learned of Europe. It has been republished in England, and also been translated into German.

D. Appleton & Co. have now in press, Dr. John Pye Smith's work on the Relation between the Holy Scriptures and some parts of Geological Science. See notice of the English Edition in the last No. of the Repository, p. 241.

Gould, Newman and Saxton, Andover & New-York have in press "An Introduction to the French Language," prepared by D Fosdick, Jr., on a plan similar to that of his German Introduction. "A German Dictionary in two parts," by the same author is in press and nearly ready for publication by Perkins & Marvin, Boston. It will be stereotyped in about 600 pages 12mo.

INDEX TO VOLUME III.

A.

Adams, Rev. N. Review of the Memoir of Mrs. Sarah L. Smith 194.

Adams, Rev. Thomas, his Exposition of the Second Epistle of Peter, noticed 235.

Age, the present, some Characteristics of, 426.

Agency, free, Inquiries respecting, 455.

Aids to Reflection, Coleridge's, noticed 506.

American Literature, Proper Character and Functions of 1. Should breathe the national spirit 2. What determines the character of a people 2. No place in American Literature for sentiments originating in the feudal system 3. Loyalty 3,—controls the manners of Europe 4. Pride of birth, its influence in Europe 6, in Great Britain 7. The law of entail 9. Contempt for labor and poverty 10. The modifications of this sentiment in our own country 11. Causes which degrade labor 12. The feudal sentiment of honor 13. Its influence in some parts of our country 14. These sentiments must be discountenanced 15. Our literature must be patriotic 15. Must inculcate respect for the laws 16. Public spirit 17. Frugality and simplicity of manners 18. Our literature is not for a noble class, but for the people 19. —must be controlled by the Christian religion 20.

Ancient and Modern Eloquence, by N. Cleaveland, Esq. 67.

Ancient and Modern Literature, the Comparative Moral Purity of 281

Anderson, Rev. Rufus D. D. Address at S. Hadley, noticed 239.

Antiquities, a new work on, noticed 511.

B.

Bacon, Rev. Leonard, on the Proper Character and Functions of American Literature 1.

Baptism: Import of Βαπτίζω, Pres. Beecher on 40. Statement of the case and principles of investigation 41. Meaning of the word *baptize* 41. Causes of the disregard of these principles 43. False positions 43. Position to be proved 45. Βαπτίζω signifies to cleanse, etc. 48. No improbability, *a priori* 48. Circumstances did exist tending to produce such a meaning 55. No probability, *a priori,* against this meaning 56. Philological proof in favor of it 57. Καθαρισμὸς synonymous with βαπτισμὸς 59. Proved by existing expectations 61, by the contrast between John's baptism and that of Christ 62. The Holy Spirit said to baptize 63. Βαπτίζω and καθαρίζω similarly used in connection with forgiveness of sins 64.

Concluded 352. Heb. 9. 10 explained, Mosaic purifications 352. The account given in Tobit 355. Purifications very numerous 356. Mark 7: 4, 8 and Luke 11: 38 explained 357. Purification is the sense 358. Remarks on Mr. Carson's views 359. The case quoted from Sirach 360. The case of Judith 362. No contrary probability 363. The religious usage all sets one way 364. How Baptism and regeneration came to be confounded 367, also the denial of water baptism 368. Other proofs 369.

Barnes, Rev. Albert, His Notes on Isaiah, noticed 503.

Beecher, Rev. Pres. Edward, on Baptism 40.

Buch, M. Von, to Prof. Robinson 31.

Bush, Prof. George, his Notes on Genesis noticed 227.

C.

Calman, E. S. on the present state of the Jewish religion 398.

Campbell, Alexander, on Campbellism, in reply to Mr. Landis 469.

" *Campbellism*," *Remarks on*, 469. Introductory and Explanatory note by the Editor 469. Letter to Mr. Campbell 470. Mr. Campbell's defence; narrative of the case 472. Hostility to Creeds 473. Difficulties and success 474. Reply to Mr. Landis on the Campbellite views of faith 476. Note by the Editor 480. Three births, three kingdoms and three salvations 481. Regeneration explained 482 Ten confessions of faith appealed to 485. The sum of the whole matter 488. Unitarianism of the Campbellites 490. Disavow both Unitarianism and Trinitarianism. 491. Not avowed Arians or Socinians 492. The folly of Arianism 493, of Socinianism 495. The translation of the New Testament adopted by the Campbellites 496. Mr. C's moral character impugned 498. Spurious readings 500. Notes by the Editor 500, 502.

Cause and Effect in Connection with Fatalism and Free Agency. Remarks on, by Rev. Dr. Woods 174. Remarks on an Anonymous Essay 174. The subject philosophical and metaphysical 175. Distinction between desire and volition 176. Is volition connected with a previous desire or motive as a producing cause? 176. The point at issue stated 179. The author of the anonymous essay contributes to overturn his own system 180. The consequences of such a theory 185. It stands in direct opposition to God's word 186, to the experience of Christians 188, to the principles of philosophy 189. The apostacy of Adam, election and special grace 191.

Chalmers, Thomas, D. D. LL. D. Lectures on Romans, noticed 234.

Characteristics of the Present Age, some of the 426. Explanatory Note by the Editor 426. Exclusive habits undesirable 427. Three great tendencies 429. The tendencies of the present age 430—1. Towards an equalization of civil privileges 431. This tendency should have limits and qualifications 434.—2. A practical tendency 436. The Reformation, the labors of Bacon, Newton, Locke and Paley 437. The revival of Christianity 438. Evils of this tendency 439.—3. General intelligence 443.—4. An infidel tendency 445. The various forms of skepticism 446.—5. The rapid disappearance of the aboriginal tribes of different countries 449.—6. The effusion of the Holy Spirit 450. The proper spirit and conduct to be maintained in view of the signs of the times 452.

Christ, the Sonship of, by Rev. Dr. Mayer 138

Christology of the Book of Enoch 86. Classical Literature, Manual of, by Eschenburg, noticed 505.

Cleaveland, N Esq., on Ancient and Modern Eloquence 67.

Coleridge's Aids to Reflection, noticed 506.

Comprehensive Commentary on the Holy Bible, noticed 229.

Critical Notices 227, 503.

D.

Dana, Rev. Daniel D. D. his Letters to Prof Stuart, noticed 253.

Davidson, Samuel, L. L. D. Lectures on Biblical Criticism, noticed 243.

Dead Sea, Robinson on the 24.

Deism, a historical sketch of, by Dr. Pond 372. Different forms of Deism 372. The earliest Deists were Jews and heathens 373. Celsus, Lucian and Porphyry 374. Hierocles 375. The emperor Julian 376. English Deists 377. Their immense influence 381. German infidelity 382. That of France and the United States 383.

Destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah 24, 324.

De Wette's Old and New Testaments, noticed 233.

Duffield, Rev. George, on the Religious character of a nation 384.

Dupin's Trial of Jesus, noticed 255.

E.

Eloquence, Ancient and Modern, N. Cleaveland, Esq. on 67. Demosthenes 67. Grecian eloquence 68. Roman eloquence, Cicero 73. Modern eloquence 76. Chatham 77. Burke, Fox, Pitt 79. Grattan, Wilberforce, Canning 81. American eloquence 82. Hamilton, Ames, Calhoun 83. Clay, Webster 84.

Enoch, the Book of, Christology of, by Prof Stuart 86. Quoted by Jude 86. Noticed by the Fathers 87. Lost 88. Discovered in Abyssinia by Bruce 89. Translated by Dr. Laurence 90. Its general plan 91. Summary of its contents 93. Extracts and remarks 105. Remarks on its Christology 112. Its early date 113. Its Christology 121. The name *Jesus* not used, but *The Elect One* 121. Son of God, Son of Woman, Messiah, Son of Man 122. The supreme and final judge 124,—is worshipped, etc. 125. The author of the Book 129. No claim to authority 130. Remarks on its quotation by Jude 134. Translated from the Greek into Ethiopic 136. Its inferiority to the gospels 137.

Errata 256.

Eschenburg, Prof J. J., his Manual of Classical Literature, by Prof. Fiske, noticed 505.

Exodus of the Israelites, the 306.

Ezekiel, the Prophet, Exposition of, by W. Greenhill, noticed 236.

F.

Fatalism and Free Agency, Remarks on, by Dr. Woods 174.

Fiske, Prof N. W. his translation Eschenburg's Manual of Classical Literature, noticed 505.

France, Literary Intelligence of 514.

Free Agency, Inquiries respecting 455. Introductory Note by the Editor 455. Difficulties respecting free agency 456. An apology for addressing Dr Woods 457. First inquiry 458. Second inquiry 460. Third inquiry 461. Fourth inquiry 462. Fifth inquiry 464. Sixth inquiry 465. Postscript 468.

G.

Genesis, Bush's Notes on, noticed 227.

Geology of Palestine, by Dr. Lee 325.

Geology, Elements of, by Dr. Lee, noticed 512.

Germany, Recent Literary Intelligence of, 512.

Goshen, the land of, 306—316.

Greenhill's Exposition of the Prophet Ezekiel, noticed 236.

Griffin, Rev. Edward D. D. D., Memoir of, noticed 255.

Gulielmi Gesenii Thesaurus Philologicus, etc. noticed 232.

H.

Herschell, Ridley H. on the present state etc. of the Jews, noticed 401.

Historical Sketch of Deism, by Dr. Pond 372.

I.

Inquiries respecting Free Agency 455.

Israelites, the land of Goshen, and the Exodus of the, Letter to the Editor by Prof. Robinson 306. Description of his route from Cairo to Suez 307. Description of the town 309. The gulf of Suez and the surrounding plain 311. The Red Sea 314. The Land of Goshen 316. Route of the Israelites to the Red Sea 318. The first day's march 319. Passage of the Red Sea 320. Two main points 321.

Isaiah, Notes on, by Albert Barnes 503.

J.

Jahn's Biblical Archæology, noticed 232.

Jenks, Rev. William D. D., his Comprehensive Commentary, noticed 229.

Jesus, the Trial of, by Dupin, noticed 255.

Jewish Religion, the present state of the, by E. S. Calman Introductory Note by the Editor 398. Rev. E. Smith's account of Mr. Calman 399. Remarks on Mr. Herschell's views 401. The sufferings of the Jews 405. Persecuted by the Roman Catholics 406. Their condition greatly meliorated 407. Many among them believe in Christ 409.

The present state of Judaism 410. Seasons of their festivals 411. The manner of their celebration 412 The feast of unleavened bread 412. Of Pentecost 413. Of trumpets 415. A supposed day of judgment 416. Days of repentance 418. Various ceremonies 419. Chanters 422. The boisterous clamor of women 424. To be continued 426.

Job and his times, by Wemyss, noticed 245.

L.

Land of Goshen and the Exodus of the Israelites 306.

Latin Synonymes, Ramshorn's Dictionary of, noticed 252.

Last Days of the Saviour, by Olshausen. noticed 233.

Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, by Dr. Chalmers, noticed 234.

Lee, Prof. Charles A., M D on the Geology of Palestine 324. On the Geology of the United States, noticed 512.

Linsley, Rev. Philip, D. D. on Religious Prejudices 257.

Literary Intelligence, recent, 512.

Literature, American, Proper Character and Functions of 1.

Literature Ancient and Modern, the Comparative Moral Purity of, by Prof Sanborn 281. Literature reflects the national character 281. The ancient Classics not to be denounced en masse 283. Religion of the ancients 284. Their poetry 284 Homer 285. Lucretius 288. Character of ancient Comedy 289. Tragedy 290. Dramatic exhibitions in England 291. Morality of the stage 292 Reign of Charles II. 293. Present character of the Theatre 294. Lyric Poetry 295. Anacreon 296. Roman lyric poetry 298. Intemperance of modern literature 299. An Anglo-Saxon festival 300. Minstrels branded as Anti-christ 301. Age of Queen Anne 302 General remarks 303.

M.

Massachusetts School Library, noticed 247.

Mayer, Rev. Lewis D. D. on the Sonship of Christ 138.

McVickar, J. M., D. D., his edition of Coleridge's Aids to Reflection, noticed 506.

Marsh, Rev. J., D. D. his edition of Coleridge's Aids to Reflection, noticed 506.

Memoir of Mrs. Sarah Lanman Smith, Review of 194.

Modern Eloquence, Ancient and 67.

Modern Literature, Ancient and, the Comparative Moral Purity of 281.

Morrison, John D. D. Parents' Friend, noticed 246.

N.

Nation, a the Religious Character of the element of its prosperity 384.

Nordheimer's Hebrew Grammar, with Syntax, noticed 256.

Notes. Critical and Practical on the Book of Genesis, by Prof. G. Bush, noticed 227.

P.

Palestine, the Geology of, by Dr. Lee, 325

Peter, the Second Epistle of, Exposition of, noticed 235.

Pond, Rev. Enoch. D. D. historical sketch of Deism 372

Prejudices. Religious. Rev. Dr Linsley on 257. Most of every man's sentiments are prejudices 258. Prejudices generally erroneous 258. Enlightened men responsible for their prejudice 259. Why then are not all Christians of one mind? 261. Not because the Bible is imperfect 262 Differences chargeable to prejudice 263. The rapid progress of error 264. Influence of disputations 265. System-building 266. Illiberality and bitterness of party leaders 268 Their unreasonableness 269 Condemned by the Scriptures 270. Bad effects 271. In what does persecution consist 271. Persecutors have a claim upon our charity 272. Example of Luther 273. Scott and Priestley 274. Chillingworth 275. The popular voice on this subject 276. The tendency of theological systems 279.

Present Age, some Characteristics of the 426.

Prosperity of a Nation, Religious Character the element of the, 384.

R.

Religion, the Jewish, the present state of 398.

Religious Character of a nation the element of its prosperity, by Mr. Duffield 384. What is meant by the religious character of a people 385. Its appropriate influence 386. Nothing else can supply its place 389. What is the character of our own nation 391. Intemperance and profanity 393. Cupidity 394. Disregard of the sacredness of an oath and of the Sabbath 395. Other symptoms of corruption 396. Yet morality and religion are advancing 397.

Religious Prejudices, by Rev. Dr. Linsley 257.

Review of the Memoir of Mrs. Sarah Lanman Smith 194.

Robinson, Rev. Edward D. D., on the Dead Sea, and the Destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah 24. On the Land of Goshen and the Exodus of the Israelites 306.

S.

Sanborn, Prof. Edwin D. on the Comparative Moral Purity of Ancient and Modern Literature 281.

Saviour, the Last Days of, noticed 233.

Schmucker, Rev. S. S., D. D., his Fraternal Appeal to the American Churches. noticed 254.

School Library, sanctioned by the Massachusetts Board of Education, noticed 247.

School District Library, by Harper and Brothers. noticed 249.

Sea, the Dead 24.

Smith, John Pye, D. D., on the Relation between the Holy Scriptures and Geological Science, noticed 241.

Smith, Mrs. Sarah Lanman, Memoir of, Reviewed by Rev. N. Adams 194. Interesting character of her conversion 194. The subject of much prayer 196. Her religious character as a sister 198. Her interest in the Mohegan Indians 199. Her marriage 199. Her embarkation as a missionary 200. Account of the mission 203. Her tasteful sensibilities 204. Her practical missionary feelings 205. Interesting incidents 206. Testimony of her husband 207. Description of her residence 208. Missionary trials 209. A sister in a foreign land 211. Her perils at sea 211. Her last sickness and the trials attending it 212. Her religious experience in the prospect of death 214 The last days of her life 215. Her happy death 217. Remarks on the cause of missions 218. The example of Mrs. Smith commended 221.

Sodom and Gomorrah, Destruction of, 24. Dr. Robinson on, 24. Note by the Editor 24 The catastrophe supposed to have been produced by the ignition of bitumen under the soil 25. Letter of Prof. Robinson to M. von Buch 26. M von Buch to Prof. R. 31. Description of the Canary Isles, by M. von Buch 34. The pitch lake in the Island of Trinidad 36.

Sodom and Gomorrah, on the destruction of, and the Geology of Palestine, by Dr. Lee. Reply to Prof. Robinson 324. Geology of Palestine 325. Limestone rock most abundant 326. Granitic rocks 327. The Dead Sea 332. Analysis of its water 333. Comparative saltness 334. Ancient accounts of the Dead Sea 335. Sulphur, salt and asphaltum 337. The current of the Jordan turned 339. At what time 339. Remarks on Prof. Robinson's suggestions 339. Considerations opposed to his views 341. The burning of asphaltum could not have destroyed the cities of the plain 343. Lot's wife 344. The catastrophe which overthrew the cities not wholly singular 347. It was probably a volcano 347.

Sonship of Christ, on the, by Rev. L. Mayer, D. D. Rom. i. 3, 4. Strictures on Hodge's Commentary on this passage 138. Several passages of Scripture examined 140. Christ declared to be the Son of God by his resurrection 142. The union of the man Christ Jesus with

the Logos 145. His oneness with the Father 147. Texts representing the Son as inferior to the Father 150. When Christ calls himself Son of God, does he claim equality with God? 153. Other titles of Christ 154. The term Son of God explained 156. Used in a sense in which there is no other Son of God 161. Other passages explained 162. Note by the Editor 166. Interpretation of Rom. 1: 3, 4. 168.

Stuart, Prof. M. Christology of the Book of Enoch 86.

T.

Turnbull, Rev. Robert, on the Theatre, noticed 256.

U.

United States, Recent Literary Intelligence of 514.

W.

Winer's Grammar of the Greek language, by Profs. Agnew and Ebbeke, noticed 238.

Woods, Rev. Leonard, D. D., on Cause and Effect, Fatalism and Free Agency 174.

X.

Xenophon's Memorabilia of Socrates, with Notes by Prof. Packard, noticed 234.

THE LITERATURE OF THE WORLD.

THE

AMERICAN ECLECTIC:

OR

A SELECTION FROM THE PERIODICAL LITERATURE OF ALL FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

CONDUCTED

BY ABSALOM PETERS, D. D., AND SELAH B. TREAT,

Editors of the American Biblical Repository:

AIDED BY AN ASSOCIATION OF LITERARY AND PROFESSIONAL GENTLEMEN.

Since issuing the Prospectus which was prefixed to the April No. of the Repository, the present editor has succeeded in making the most satisfactory arrangements for the editorial charge of the Repository and the Eclectic. He is happy to announce that the Rev. S. B. Treat, having, for reasons connected with the state of his health, asked a dismission from his late parochial charge in Newark, N. J., has engaged to become associate editor of the two works, and will enter immediately upon his labors.

Thus united, the editors hope to increase the labor and talent bestowed upon the Biblical Repository, and to render it still more worthy of its present reputation, as containing the best specimens of American research and discussion in the departments of biblical and general literature. At the same time they will devote themselves, with fresh energy, to their new work, which contemplates a general and comprehensive view of the periodical literature of the world, that of our own country alone excepted.

We have also secured the pledge of such occasional aid as may be required in the preparation of the Eclectic from a number of literary and professional gentlemen, who are familiar with the departments of learning and research, in which they will render their assistance. The names of these gentlemen will hereafter be given to the public as a guaranty of the talent and fidelity with which the materials of the work are intended to be selected and combined.

The necessity of arrangements thus enlarged will appear from the great variety of matter and the wide field of inquiry to be embraced in the contemplated publication. Its materials, with the exception of editorial remarks, are to be derived from the periodical Journals, Repositories and Reviews of all foreign countries. The selections from these numerous sources will illustrate every department of useful knowledge,—literary, religious, political, biblical, historical, geographical, etc. etc.; and these selections must be so presented as to constitute a work of permanent value to the possessor. The whole field, therefore, must be surveyed in the various languages in which the Journals, etc., are published,—the English, German, French, Italian, Swedish, Danish, Modern Greek, etc. Thus to investigate the original sources of the work will require a thorough acquaintance with these several languages, and, through them, with the literature which they embrace. Such an acquaintance with the entire field the editors cannot hope, personally, at once to possess. But with the aid already secured, and through the correspondence which they propose to open with foreign scholars and American residents in foreign lands, they have the highest confidence in their ability to construct a Periodical, on the plan proposed, more interesting and valuable than is now to be found in any language. Its articles, on every variety of important topic, selected, translated and explained, will present in our own tongue, and in a popular form, a comprehensive view of "the Literature of the World."

It will be perceived that we have slightly changed the proposed title of the work. This has been done as a matter of taste, and to express more fully its comprehensive design.

In the first Prospectus it was stated that this work would

not be commenced until a sufficient number of subscribers should be obtained to ensure its support. The number required has not yet been fully reached ; but we are happy to state, that by the names already recorded, and the pledges received from agents and others who express the warmest interest in the success of the undertaking, we regard the condition above expressed as having been substantially met.

It was also intimated, in the former Prospectus, that the work might be commenced in the present month. The delay, however, which was required to obtain the necessary encouragement, and the extended arrangements indispensable to the thorough accomplishment of a plan involving so much expense and labor, as well as literary qualification, has rendered so early a commencement of our publication impracticable. We cannot now hope to issue the first No. of the work before the month of November next. *Subscribers may confidently expect then to receive it.*

The work will be issued on every alternate month from the date of the first No. making six Nos. a year, of 204 pages each, which will be prepared with title-pages and indexes, to be bound in two volumes of more than 600 pages each. It will be printed in the type of this prospectus, on an enlarged page, and the amount of reading will exceed, by more than one half, that of the American Biblical Repository, and other Five Dollar Quarterlies.

The price will be Five Dollars per annum, *in advance*, or Six Dollars, if delayed till after the delivery of the first No.

As the expenses of commencing the work will be large, payments, in advance, will be gratefully received.

Every subscriber will be allowed One Dollar, on his own subscription, for each additional subscription he will procure and for which he will become responsible.

Communications, *postage paid*, may be addressed to the Editors.

ERRATA.

Page 115,—14th line, for *siliquæ*, read *siliqua*.
" 166,— 5th line from bottom, for *Fronde*, read *Froude*.
" 172,— 3rd line from bottom, for *bath-rooms*, read *ball-rooms*.
APRIL No.
" 439,— 6th line, for *or*, read *on*.

THE

AMERICAN

BIBLICAL REPOSITORY;

DEVOTED TO

Biblical and General Literature, Theological Discussion, the History of Theological Opinions, etc.

CONDUCTED BY

ABSALOM PETERS, D. D., AND SELAH B. TREAT.

SECOND SERIES.
VOL. FOURTH.—NOS. VII, VIII.—WHOLE NOS. XXXIX, XL.

NEW-YORK:

PUBLISHED BY WM. R. PETERS, OFFICE OF THE REPOSITORY,
89 NASSAU, CORNER OF FULTON-STREET.

BOSTON:

WHIPPLE & DAMRELL, NO. 9 CORNHILL.

LONDON:

WILEY & PUTNAM, 35 PATERNOSTER ROW.

1840.

ENTERED according to act of Congress, in the year 1840, by William R. Peters, in the Clerk's Office of the Southern District of New-York.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME IV.

NO. VII.

Page

ART. I. FUTURE PUNISHMENT, AS EXHIBITED IN THE BOOK OF ENOCH. By Prof. M. Stuart, Andover, Mass. . . . 1

ART. II. ON THE DESIGNATIONS OF TIME IN DANIEL AND JOHN. THE 1260 DAYS OF DANIEL AND JOHN, AND THE 1000 YEARS OF JOHN. By Rev. William Allen, D. D., Northampton, Mass. . 35

ART. III. THE ASPECT AND POSITION OF THE MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE, PARTICULARLY IN THE ORIENTAL WORLD. By Rev. George B. Cheever, New-York 54

ART. IV. MANNER IN THE PREACHER. By Prof. G. Shepard, Theol. Sem. Bangor, Me. . . . 78

ART. V. THE PIETY OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS. By Prof. C. E. Stowe, D. D., Lane Sem. Cincinnati, Ohio 91
Their Principles in respect to God and his Word, the Lord Jesus Christ, themselves, their brethren and the unconverted World 93
Their conduct in the Church, the business of life, etc. . . 103

ART. VI. THE HUSKS THAT THE SWINE DID EAT. By Rev. S. H. Cox, D. D., Brooklyn, N. Y. . 112

ART. VII. THE INFLUENCE OF THE AGE UPON POETRY, AND OF POETRY UPON THE AGE. By Grenville Mellen, New-York . . 116
Schools of Poetry . . . 120
Influence of Criticism upon Poetry 125
The Higher Range of Poetry . 131
The Drama 134
Influence of Christianity upon Poetry, etc. etc. 136

ART. VIII. SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE ECCLESIASTICAL AND RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF ENGLAND 147

ART. IX. THE PRESENT STATE OF THE JEWISH RELIGION [Concluded]. By E. S. Calman, Missionary to the Jews in Palestine 176
Note by the Editor, . . 201

Page

ART. X. A BRIEF REPLY TO THE "REMARKS" OF ALEXANDER CAMPBELL IN DEFENCE OF THE DOCTRINES OF "CAMPBELLISM." By Rev. R. W. Landis . 203

ART. XI. REMARKS ON CAUSE AND EFFECT IN CONNECTION WITH FATALISM AND FREE AGENCY [Continued]. By Rev. Leonard Woods, D. D., Theol. Sem. Andover, Mass. . . . 217
Moral Necessity . . . 233
The Great Mistake . . . 234
Fatalism 236
Self-denial 241
Practical Influence . . 242

ART. XII. CRITICAL NOTICES.
1. Rauch's Psychology . 243
2. Emerson's Translation of Wiggers' Augustinism and Pelagianism . . . 247
3. Ancient Christianity, and the Oxford Tracts . . 248
4. The Sidereal Heavens, by Dick 251
5. Upham on Disordered Mental Action 252
6. Tappan's Doctrine of the Will 253
7. Philip's Life and Opinions of Milne 256
8. Southgate's Tour through Armenia, etc. . . . 257
9. Scripture and Geology, by J. Pye Smith . . 258
10. Scotland and the Scotch, by Catherine Sinclair . . 259
11. Prize Essays on a Congress of Nations . . . 259
12. A Tribute to the Memory of Fitzhugh Smith . . 260
13. Domestic Education, by Dr. Humphrey . . . 261
14. The Poet's Tribute, by W. B. Tappan 261
15. Kirk's Sermons . . . 262
16. The Museum of Religious Knowledge . . . 262
17. Letters from the Old World 263
18. Scripture Doctrine, etc., by N. S. Folsom . . 263
19. Adams' Letter on Atonement 263
20. President Beecher on Baptism 264
21. A New Work on Geology 264

NO. VIII.

Page

ART. I. THE JORDAN AND ITS VALLEY. By Prof. Edward Robinson, D. D. New-York . 266
Introductory Note by the Editors . . . 266

ART. II. THE PRIMITIVE STATE OF MANKIND. By Pres. Philip Lindsley, D. D., Nashville, Tennessee . . . 277

ART. III. THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF JOHN THE EVANGELIST. By Edward E. Salisbury, New-Haven, Conn. . . 299

ART. IV. THE ANCIENT COMMERCE OF WESTERN ASIA. By Rev. Albert Barnes, Philadelphia . . . 310

ART. V. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF ENGLISH LITERATURE. By Rev. N. Porter, Jr., New-Milford, Conn. . . 32

ART. VI. THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE GNOSTICS—ITS ORIGIN, NATURE AND INFLUENCE ON CHRISTIANITY. By Henry T. Cheever, Bangor, Me. . . 353

ART. VII. AN ESSAY ON THE POWER OF THE WILL OVER THE OTHER FACULTIES. By the Author of an Essay on Cause and Effect, etc. . . 378
Note by the Editors, . 378

ART. VIII. REVIEW OF HENGSTENBERG'S CHRISTOLOGY. By Prof. J. Packard, Alexandria, D. C. . . . 393

ART. IX. THE DOCTRINE OF CHRISTIAN PERFECTION, EXPLAINED AND DEFENDED; WITH STRICTURES ON MR. FOLSOM'S REVIEW OF "MAHAN ON CHRISTIAN PERFECTION." By Rev. Asa Mahan, Oberlin, Ohio . 408
Explanatory Note by the Editors . . . 480

ART. X. RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN FRANCE. By an American in Paris . . . 429

ART. XI. REMARKS IN REFERENCE TO AN ANONYMOUS "ESSAY ON CAUSE AND EFFECT," AND TO THE QUESTIONS OF "INQUIRER." By Leonard Woods, D. D. Andover, Mass. . . 467

ART. XII. CRITICAL NOTICES.
1. History of American Missions, . . . 485
2. Keightley's History of Greece 488
3. Keightley's History of Rome, 488
4. Keightley's History of England, . . . 488
5. Paine's Med. and Phys. Commentaries, . . 491
6. Burton's Church History, 493
7. Macauley's Essay, . 495
8. History of Rhode Island, 496
9. Hitchcock's Geology, . 497
10. Felton's Translation of Menzel, ... 498
12. Fosdick's French Introduction, . . . 500
11. Nichol's Architecture of the Heavens, . . 501
13. Hall on Baptism, . 502
14. Kurtz on Baptism, . 503
15. Hill's History of Presbyterianism, . . . 504
16. Murray's British America, 505
17. Payne's Letter to the Editor, 506
18. Nordheimer's Hebrew Grammar, . . . 506

ERRATA.

Page 299,—16th line from the bottom for *kind*, read *hired*.
" 302,—18th line from the bottom, for *future*, read *further*.
" 325,—1st line from the top, for *Saleucia*, read *Tadmor*.
" 372,—8th and 26th lines from the top, for *Pyschie*, read *Psyche*.
" " —9th and 25th lines from the top, for *Hylie*, read *Hyle*.

CONTENTS OF NO. VII.

Page

ART. I. FUTURE PUNISHMENT, AS EXHIBITED IN THE BOOK OF ENOCH 1
By Prof. M. Stuart, Andover, Mass.

II. ON THE DESIGNATIONS OF TIME IN DANIEL AND JOHN. THE 1260 DAYS OF DANIEL AND JOHN, AND THE 1000 YEARS OF JOHN 35
By Rev. William Allen, D. D., Northampton, Mass.

III. THE ASPECT AND POSITION OF THE MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE, PARTICULARLY IN THE ORIENTAL WORLD 54
By Rev. George B. Cheever, New-York.

IV. MANNER IN THE PREACHER 78
By Prof. G. Shepard, Theol. Sem. Bangor, Me.

V. THE PIETY OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS 91
By Prof. C. E. Stowe, D. D., Lane Sem. Cincinnati, Ohio.

Their Principles in respect to God and his Word, the Lord Jesus Christ, themselves, their brethren and the unconverted World . . . 93
Their conduct in the Church, the business of life, etc. 103

VI. THE HUSKS THAT THE SWINE DID EAT 112
By Rev. S. H. Cox, D. D., Brooklyn, N. Y.

VII. THE INFLUENCE OF THE AGE UPON POETRY, AND OF POETRY UPON THE AGE 116
By Grenville Mellen, New-York.

Schools of Poetry 120
Influence of Criticism upon Poetry 125
The Higher Range of Poetry 131
The Drama 134
Influence of Christianity upon Poetry, etc. etc. 136

VIII. SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE ECCLESIASTICAL AND RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF ENGLAND 147

Page

IX. The Present State of the Jewish Religion, [Concluded] 176
By E. S. Calman, Missionary to the Jews in Palestine.

Note by the Editor 201

X. A Brief Reply to the "Remarks" of Alexander Campbell in Defence of the Doctrines of "Campbellism" 203
By Rev. R. W. Landis.

XI. Remarks on Cause and Effect in connection with Fatalism and Free Agency, [Continued] . 217
By Rev. Leonard Woods, D. D., Theol. Sem. Andover, Mass.

Moral Necessity 233
The Great Mistake 234
Fatalism 236
Self-denial 241
Practical Influence 242

XII. Critical Notices.

1. Rauch's Psychology 243
2. Emersons's Translation of Wiggers' Augustinism and Pelagianism 247
3. Ancient Christianity, and the Oxford Tracts. 248
4. The Sidereal Heavens, by Dick 251
5. Upham on Disordered Mental Action . . . 252
6. Tappan's Doctrine of the Will 253
7. Philip's Life and Opinions of Milne . . . 256
8. Southgate's Tour through Armenia, etc. . 257
9. Scripture and Geology, by J. Pye Smith . . 258
10. Scotland and the Scotch, by Catherine Sinclair 259
11. Prize Essays on a Congress of Nations . . 259
12. A Tribute to the Memory of Fitzhugh Smith 260
13. Domestic Education, by Dr. Humphrey . 261
14. The Poet's Tribute, by W. B. Tappan . . 261
15. Kirk's Sermons 262
16. The Museum of Religious Knowledge . . 262
17. Letters from the Old World 263
18. Scripture Doctrine, etc., by N. S. Folsom . 263
19. Adams' Letter on Atonement 263
20. President Beecher on Baptism 264
21. A New Work on Geology 264

THE

AMERICAN

BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

JULY, 1840.

SECOND SERIES, NO. VII.—WHOLE NO. XXXIX.

ARTICLE I.

Future Punishment, as exhibited in the Book of Enoch.*

By M. Stuart, Prof. Sac. Lit. in the Theol. Seminary at Andover.

Next to the inquiry: Whether the soul is immortal, stands, in point of importance and interest, the question: *Whether there is a state of reward and punishment beyond the grave, and whether that state is* eternal? A more fearful question cannot be raised by the human mind, than by asking: Whether the punishment of the wicked in a future world, is to be regarded as endless.

No reflecting man can wonder, that so many among us are deeply agitated by this subject. While the great majority of Christians consider the inquiry, suggested by this last question, as answered, yea fully answered, by the Scriptures, yet there are not a few, who claim to be considered as Christians, whose minds are filled with difficulty in respect

* This article was prepared for the April No. of the Repository, but was deferred for the want of room. It was designed to follow the very valuable article by Prof. Stuart, on the "Book of Enoch," which appeared in the No. for January last, page 86 seq., to which the reader is referred for an account of that interesting relic of antiquity.—Editor.

to the subject of endless misery in a future world; and no inconsiderable number, who reject, even with scorn and contumely, the idea that such a doom for the human soul is possible.

It is no part of my present object to enter the lists of controversy at large in regard to this subject. That many are greatly agitated in respect to it, is so far from being strange, or in itself criminal, that I could wish many thousands, who are now altogether indifferent with regard to every inquiry of such a nature, might be aroused to a state of deep concern. There is always more hope from a state of concern, than from one of apathy. Baxter says, that *spiritual sloth* has sent more souls to perdition, than all the other causes which can be named.

Let us not despair of being listened to by such as are agitated in respect to a future state. If it be true that some have passed on to that condition, in which they can only look scorn and breathe contempt when the doctrine of endless punishment is mentioned, we will still hope, that in a land of gospel light and free inquiry, there are not many who have been able to attain to such a fearful attitude of mind.

I can never think on the subject of future punishment, without spontaneously asking: *Why should I disbelieve it?* If it be true, that there is no punishment of the wicked hereafter, then I shall be as much a participator of all the good which is to come, as if I were a believer in the doctrine of those who affirm this. The only reward for belief in this case, will be a hope, such as it is, during the present life, that I shall be happy hereafter, come what may in this world, or do what I may please to do. And yet my conscience, in spite of myself, would be continually at war with such a hope, on such gronnds. There is "a fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which will devour the adversaries," implanted by our Maker in the human breast, in order to proclaim within us that there is a God who will judge the world in righteousness, who abhors sin and loves holiness, and who will exhibit to the creatures of his power his love of the one and his hatred of the other. Conscience can be stilled in respect to these fears, only by doing to her the most absolute violence, binding her in chains, hoodwinking her, or administering opiates in large quantities. The latter is the usual method of keeping her quiet. But alas! it is only

a dreamy and feverish sleep that is procured. Sins committed are followed by the fear of punishment, whether we will or not. This is the voice of God that speaks to the soul made in his image, but now degraded and defaced by sin. Conscience whispers that *retribution will come.* We may stop our ears; we may drown her voice with music or with shouting; all these expedients are but temporary. When every artifice is wearied out, and every shout which overpowered the still small voice has ceased, then comes the tremendous whisper again. In our lonely recesses, in the dead of night, on the bed of sickness, in the hour of danger, of trial, of misfortune—conscience whispers with an accent that penetrates the inmost recesses of the soul: "There is a God who judgeth the earth"—"God is angry with the wicked every day."

Where, O where, is an asylum from this still small voice, more terrific than the seven thunders which shake the throne of heaven? Is it to be found in plunging deep into the pleasures of sense? But how can it be found there? These are short, unsatisfying, often attended with satiety and disgust even in the very height of them; and, at all events, they are but temporary. Shall the refuge be found, then, in confident assertion, in presumptuous belief, that there is no future punishment? But how will these alter the case? The measures of a just God are not to be influenced by our declarations, nor by our presumption. When we have scoffed at his justice, or derided the moral retribution which he intends to make—there is no change in him nor in his measures. When we call in question his word; or even labour to make it proclaim the future freedom of the wicked from all punishment; it is not the boldness of our assertions, nor the rashness of our criticisms on the Scriptures, nor the zeal with which we may contend for our professed belief in the common happiness of the pious and the impious, which can change the declarations of the Scriptures, or repeal one awful commination which they contain. There the assurance is given, that when the Saviour is seated on his throne of final judgment, and all nations are assembled before him, he will separate them as a shepherd divides his sheep from the goats—to the one he will assign ζωὴν αἰώνιον, to the other κόλασιν αἰώνιον. The punishment is characterized by the *same* adjective as the reward; and if the life be endless in

this case, then the *punishment* must also be endless. If not, the whole declaration has no intelligible meaning.

With such an avowal before us as this, from the lips of him who is himself to be our final judge, is it acting a reasonable part, to shut our ears against it, and, in accordance with our wishes, maintain that even the Bible itself establishes the doctrine of universal salvation, or at least of ultimate universal restoration? The laws of *exegesis* remonstrate against this conclusion; and if they are not to be trusted, what confidence can we place in any thing that we deduce from the Bible? It lies on the very face of the Scriptures, that heaven is no more affirmed to be endless, than hell is. An interpretation which makes the latter temporary, must shake our faith in the permanency of the former. The whole matter stands or falls together.

I have been not a little surprised, therefore, at the violence which has often been put upon the words *ἀιών* and עוֹלָם, in order to show that they may designate a *temporary* period. It is indeed true, that they may be employed to designate a period which is in its own nature temporary; but then it is plain enough in such cases, that they are employed in order to make *the strongest expression of duration that the nature of the case will admit;* and they are chosen for such a purpose on the very ground, that they naturally designate an *endless* length of time. If not, then neither the Greek nor the Hebrew has the power of expressing this idea, nor any specific name for it.

But I find myself unconsciously drawn into a train of reflections on this subject, which it is not my present design to pursue. My immediate object may be stated in a few words, and should be plainly stated in order that the reader may understand it.

It has often been asserted by disputants respecting the subject of future punishment, that the early periods of Christianity were strangers to the doctrine of the *endless misery* of the wicked; and, consequently, that all the assertions of such a doctrine are grounded only in the fears of men, or in pious fraud, or in a mistake respecting the meaning of scriptural language. When those who maintain the doctrine of endless punishment appeal to the Bible in confirmation of it, they are told, that it is only by misinterpreting the Bible, that such a doctrine can be made out from it.

What then is the ultimate appeal, in a case of this nature? It will be allowed, I suppose, by all reasonable men, that the scriptural writers employed language according to its usual meaning at the period when they wrote. A dispute, however, exists between those who affirm and those who deny the future and endless punishment of the wicked, whether the *usus loquendi* of the Scriptures is of such a nature as to confirm the doctrine maintained by the former. No texts that can be brought will satisfy the latter, so long as they believe that the usages of ancient times, as to the language in question, were contrary to what the former class allege. In this state of things, then, it would seem desirable to consult other books besides the Bible—books written about the same period as the scriptural ones, and presenting us with the usual views of those times in regard to the great subject before us.

Should we find now, after such consultation, that the common belief of the Jews to whom the Scriptures were primarily addressed, was such as now generally prevails, i. e. that endless punishment was a matter of common belief among them; then we must come to the conclusion, either that the New Testament writers meant to teach the same doctrine, or else that they have, in an inexplicable manner, left their writings in such a state, that the great mass of men have misunderstood and must naturally misunderstand them. Why did not the sacred writers explicitly, plainly, purposely, and avowedly, correct the common opinion among the Jews in respect to this subject? Honesty and fidelity would seem to have demanded this of them, if this opinion had been such as some allege it to have been.

The book of Enoch, as we have seen in a preceding number of this Miscellany, was composed by a *Jew*, unusually familiar with the Old Testament Scriptures, and probably having some acquaintance with those of the New. It was composed in all probability during the latter half of the first century of the Christian era. It was written by a serious man, and for serious purposes. The reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked are the great theme of the author's work. It may therefore be of some importance to discover what are the views of this writer respecting the future punishment of the wicked. It will help us to know what were the usual sentiments of his time, cherished by persons who reflected on the subject of religion.

I may remark also, that the manner of the writer is such, when he speaks of this subject, as to shew that in his view it is *not* a controverted one—at least, that only mockers at all religion controverted it. He evidently expects, that his readers will not call in question what he says about the nature or duration of the punishment to be inflicted upon the wicked. Such a position of course indicates, that he utters only a common sentiment on this topic; and if so, then we can get some light from what he says, concerning the religious opinions of his time.

It is not my design to repeat all which the writer says, on the subject before us. To do so, would be to make larger extracts from his book than is necessary; and I should, moreover, be in danger of wearying the patience of the reader. I shall therefore omit the mere declarations, almost without number, that God will punish the wicked and reward the righteous; for these, although they have a general and even important bearing on our subject at large, still do not determine the point *how much* or *how long* the wicked are to be punished. Let us confine our attention, then, to those passages which cast some light on the subject last named.

I begin with the author's denunciation of the wicked in chap. 6: 5 seq. "Ye wicked in heart, no peace shall be to you! Therefore your days shall you curse, and the years of your lives shall perish; perpetual execration shall be multiplied, and you shall not obtain mercy."

The leader of the sinning angels is thus sentenced by the Most High: "Bind Azazyel hand and foot; cast him into darkness . . . . there shall he remain for ever; cover his face that he may not see the light; and in the great day of judgment let him be cast into the fire;" chap. 10: 6 seq.

In respect to the giants, the supposed progeny of sinning angels and the daughters of men, Michael is ordered to "bind them for seventy generations underneath the earth, even to the day of judgment and of consummation, until the judgment, which will last for ever, be completed; then shall they be taken away into the lowest depths of the fire in torments, and in confinement shall they be shut up for ever;" chap. 10: 15 seq.

Again, in another place, the sinning angels are told by Enoch, acting by special commission from God (so the book represents him): "Judgment has been passed upon you; your request [for pardon] will not be granted to you;

from this time forward never shall you ascend into heaven ;" chap 14 : 3 seq. Again : " Never shall you obtain peace ;" chap. 16 : 5.

Afterwards Enoch is represented as taken by his conducting angel to see the place where the souls of the wicked are kept. Of them it is said : "Abundant is their suffering until the time of the great judgment, the castigation, and the torment of those who continually execrate, whose souls are punished and bound there for ever ;" 22 : 12. So in in 22 : 14, " Their souls shall not be annihilated in the day of judgment, neither shall they arise out of this place."

In chap 38 : 2 seq. it is said of the wicked : " Better for them would it be, had they never been born. . . . Impious men shall be afflicted in presence of the righteous and the elect . . . Nor thenceforward shall any obtain commiseration from the Lord of spirits."

Chap. 39 : 2, " Never shall they [the wicked] obtain mercy, saith the Lord of spirits." Chap. 46 : 4, " Darkness shall be their habitation, and worms shall be their bed ; nor from their bed shall they hope to be again raised, because they exalted not the name of the Lord of spirits." And again in 48 : 11, " In his presence shall they [the wicked] fall, and not be raised up again ; nor shall there be any one to take them out of his hands to lift them up ; for they have denied the name of the Lord of spirits, and of his Messiah." In 49 : 11 is the like declaration : " He who repents not before him shall perish. Henceforth I will not have mercy upon them, saith the Lord of spirits."

In chap. 54 : 8 it is said of the paramours of the apostate angels : " The days of their life shall be consumed, but the days of their error [i. e. in which they will suffer the consequences of their error] shall be innumerable." In 66 : 9, 10 it is said of those who have denied the Lord of spirits : " They will perceive their condemnation, day by day . . . . and as the inflammation of their bodies shall be great, so shall their spirits undergo a change for ever."

In chap. 67 : 2 seq., Michael and Raphael are represented as beholding the punishment of the apostate angels ; then Michael exclaims : " The severity of the judgment, of the secret judgment of the angels, the endurance of that severe jndgment which has taken place and been made permanent, who is capable of beholding, without being melted at the

sight of it? . . . . The Lord of spirits . . . will bring upon them a secret judgment for ever and ever . . . . they alone shall receive their own judgment for ever and ever."

In the like manner sinners among men are denounced: "Wo unto them who build up iniquity and oppression, and who lay the foundation of fraud; for suddenly shall they be subverted, and never obtain peace:" 93: 6. And again in the sequel, v. 10: "When you fall, he will not shew you mercy; your Creator will rejoice in your destruction."

In chap. 94: 4 it is said of the wicked who have bound themselves by an oath to do evil: "The remedy is far removed from you on account of your sins." In 96: 18 seq. it is said respecting sinners: "Know that you are destined to the day of destruction; hope not that sinners shall live; in process of time you shall die, for you are not marked for redemption . . . . To you there shall be no peace; you shall surely die suddenly." Again: "Wo to you who build your houses by the labour of others . . . with the stone of crime; I tell you that you shall not obtain peace;" 97: 13.

So in chap. 97: 7 seq. "Wo to you, ye sinners, . . . in the flame of a blazing fire shall you be burned." Chap. 102: 5, "But you, ye sinners, are for ever accursed; to you there shall be no peace." More at large in 103: 5; "Has it not been shown to them [to sinners], that their evil deeds shall become their greatest torment, when their souls shall be made to descend to the receptacle of the dead? Into darkness, into the snare, and into the flame which shall burn to the great judgment, shall their spirits enter; and the great judgment shall take effect for ever and ever. Wo to you, for to you shall be no peace."

Of the righteous it is said in 104: 3, "You shall not be found like sinners; and eternal condemnation shall be far from you, so long as the world exists." That is, the righteous shall not suffer *eternal condemnation*, as the wicked do; this shall never be their lot, so long as the world endures.

Again, chap. 105: 21, "Wait . . . until evil doers be consumed, . . . until sin pass away; for their names [those of the wicked] shall be blotted out of the holy books, their seed shall be destroyed, and their spirits slain . . . . In the flame of fire there is the clamour of exclamation, of wo, and of great suffering." Who will not here spontaneously call to mind, that "weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth,"

which the Saviour declares shall come upon those "who are cast into outer darkness?" Indeed, in a subsequent verse (v. 28) the writer says of the wicked: "They shall be cast into darkness."

Such is the view which the author of the Book of Enoch has given of the future punishment of the wicked. Of the passages which relate to this subject, I have, as I intimated at the commencement of these extracts, selected only a small part. Even of those which either directly or indirectly announce the *endless* doom of the wicked, I have not transcribed all. But so many have now been presented, that I cannot help thinking it would be irrational and exceedingly unfair, to deny that the writer of the book before us believed in the doctrine of *eternal* punishment. I do not see how it is in the power of human language to convey this idea, if he has not most explicitly and undeniably conveyed it.

The intelligent and considerate reader will not fail to note, that the doctrine in question is not made here to depend merely on the use of the words *for ever*, or *for ever and ever*. It is expressed in a great variety of ways, so great, that no room seems to be left for any uncertainty as to the purpose of the author's mind. "No pardon shall be given them;" "they shall not arise out of their place" [of punishment]; "it would be better for them had they never been born;" "they shall not be lifted up from their bed of worms and distress;" "they shall perish;" "the Lord will not have mercy upon them;" "the days of their error [i. e. of punishment for error] shall be innumerable;" "the remedy is removed far from them on account of their sins;" "they are not marked for redemption;" "they shall have no peace;" "the great judgment shall take effect upon them for ever and ever." More numerous still are the declarations, that their torment or punishment shall last "*for ever and ever*," and that "*they shall never have peace*."

Such is the fearful array of comminations against the wicked, in the book before us. If we add to these the often and every where repeated threats, in general terms, of judgment, condemnation, punishment, chastisement, and suffering, it will be evident beyond all doubt, certainly beyond all reasonable contradiction, how the writer of the book of Enoch thought and felt in regard to the subject under consideration.

But granting that the declarations in the book before us are plain, and scarcely capable of being perverted or obscured, the question will no doubt be promptly asked: 'To what purpose is an appeal to a book confessedly *apocryphal*, and therefore of *no authority?* Why should we believe in the doctrine of eternal punishment, because an unknown writer of an unknown period, who was (as nearly all agree) an uninspired man, has expressed his belief in such a repulsive dogma?'

I have already anticipated, in part, an answer to this question, in what I have said in the introductory part of this communication. But to avoid all ambiguity as to my views and my object, on the present occasion, I would state in the most explicit manner, that I have not the most distant intention to refer to the book of Enoch, as a book of *authority*. I can never be brought to believe that the Ethiopians had any good right to place it in their Canon; not so much ground, even, as the Council of Trent had to admit and sanction the books commonly named *apocryphal* among us. There is less of puerility and of superstition in most of the so named *Apocrypha*, than in the book of Enoch. I have therefore not the remotest design to urge on my readers the *authority* of this book. My full belief is, that "our present Scriptures are the *only* and the *sufficient* rule of faith and practice."

Still this detracts nothing from the importance or propriety of my design. I resort to the book of Enoch, in order to find the *usus loquendi* of the times, when the books of the New Testament were written, and also to find what were the prevailing opinions of the same times in respect to the great point under discussion. Whatever uncertainty may attend the question respecting the individual author of the book, or the exact year when it was composed, still I cannot concede, that there is any uncertainty worth computing, whether the author lived and wrote during the first century of the Christian era. That he was a Jew intimately acquainted with the ancient Scriptures, cannot be called in question by any reader of candour and intelligence. That he was a man of a serious, devout frame of mind, of high moral susceptibilities, and disposed to place the standard of moral actions high, is exhibited in every part of his work. That he speculates on demons, and on matters of astronomy

and natural philosophy, in such a way that we are compelled to regard some of his views as even childish—is no good reason why we may not receive his testimony about plain matters of fact within his cognisance. If such things were to destroy the credit of a writer, then alas! for most of the Christian fathers; in whom we can find not a few things which are little, if any, less repugnant to sound reason and philosophy, than what is found in the book of Enoch. The testimony of this book, as to the common opinion of the times respecting the perpetuity of future punishment, may then be received, without transgressing the usual laws of a critical examination of testimony concerning any usage or opinion of ancient times.

But I shall be asked: 'How does it appear from the contents of the book of Enoch, that the usual opinion of the Jews of his day, or of the Christians of his day (in case the author were a Christian), was, that the future punishment of the wicked is *endless?* The author speaks for *himself*, and we can only gather from what he says, the opinions which he himself entertained.'

This, I answer, might be said in respect to some things in his book; e. g. the peculiar manner in which he accounts for the phenomena of nature, and the motions and phases of the heavenly bodies. But the subject of future retribution is a matter of common speculation and of deep concern to all sober men. It is one about which the common people, as well as the learned, have an opinion. And the manner in which a writer introduces this, will always satisfy any intelligent reader, whether it is a matter of dispute and singularity of opinion with the author, or whether he only alludes to it and states it as a thing which will be taken for granted, or at least allowed, by his readers.

It is on this ground that I place the appeal, in the present case, to the book of Enoch. Let any one read it attentively, I should rather say, *study* it, and he will easily perceive, that it is no part of the writer's plan to maintain a *disputed* doctrine. His threats against the wicked, which are very frequent, proceed upon the acknowledged ground, that there is a just God who governs the world, and who will make retribution to sinners. That retribution he holds up as *endless*, because this, and this only, sets forth the aggravated nature of their doom in its full extent. There are no marks in the

book, at least I have found none, of a *dispute*, on the part of the writer, in favour of the doctrine that future punishment will be endless.

Such being the case, why are we not to suppose that he bears testimony, in this way, to a prevailing (I do not say *universal*) sentiment of his time, in regard to the matter before us? I know of no laws for the examination and judging of testimony, which would lead us to reject his evidence in this case. On the contrary, the testimony which he gives, in this indirect way, is in its nature more convincing and satisfactory, than if we had found him to be disputing in order to maintain the doctrine of endless punishment.

Had I time and did the present circumstances permit, the same view which he takes of this subject might be greatly confirmed by appeal to other ancient documents, nearly cotemporaneous with the Book of Enoch. Such are the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, the fourth book of Ezra, a part of the so-called Sibylline Oracles, and (if we may number this among the productions of the primitive age) the Shepherd of Hermas. This latter book, however, I cannot well doubt, must be placed some 70 or 80 years later than the other productions here named; and the testimony is at least doubtful.

He who peruses with attention all these works, can never doubt what was the common belief of the primitive age, on the subject of *endless* punishment. Even the common mythology of the heathen made a Tartarus, from which there is no escape. That they believed in a kind of *purgatory*, also, will not disprove the other position; for only sinners in a mitigated degree were admissible to purgatory.

I may then, with such evidence before me, assume the fact, that a belief in endless punishment, in the primitive age of Christianity, was general and usual. Those who thought of retribution at all, and believed in it, seem to have adopted the belief, that it was to have no end.

I may be permitted then to ask once more: Why did not Jesus and his apostles, who must have known what the common belief was, in case they deemed it to be erroneous—why did they not correct it? As honest and upright and simple-hearted teachers, would they not have done so? Should they not have done so? We are entitled to put this last question; for no subject which can come before the human

mind is more agitating, or more deeply interesting, than that which respects the duration of future misery. If Jesus and his disciples actually knew that all men will finally be saved, how can we deem it probable that they should not have written this in characters of light, or spoken it with a voice that would echo around the earth? Of all possible messages this would have been one of the deepest concern to the hopes of our perishing race.

Why then have those holy teachers failed to make *explicit* declarations, which admit of no doubt and no misinterpretation, in regard to this matter? If I should be told, as I may be by some, that they have made such declarations; my answer is, that after making the Scriptures the principal object of my study through most of my life, I have not been able to find them. I have sought for them with great solicitude; in one sense I can say truly, that I have hoped to find them. I know not how to account for it, then, if prejudice has so blinded my eyes that I cannot find them—cannot find them although they would afford unspeakable relief to my mind, when agonized with the thought that future misery is to be endless. Can it be, that the Bible does plainly and explicitly and often avow, what I have never been able to find, although sought for with so deep an interest?

I will not deny that it can be. No man is infallible; scarcely any one free from some prejudice. I have no feelings that would lead me to exempt myself from the common infirmities of my fellow beings; and therefore I admit that it is quite possible, that I have entirely overlooked what some affirm to be one of the plainest doctrines in all the Scriptures. Still, my present convictions speak not the less to my own mind. I cannot find in the Scriptures a *disavowal* of the usual belief of the primitive age as to endless punishment; nor can I find where an opinion contrary to this is taught, or even suggested, in the Bible.

I have examined and re-examined, oftentimes, those texts which are alleged to teach the doctrine of universal salvation; but no principles of interpretation which I can adopt for the rest of the Scriptures, will permit me to explain them in such a way. I do not, and cannot, find the evidence, therefore, that Jesus and his disciples have contradicted the views of future punishment, as set forth in the book of Enoch; I mean so far as the perpetuity and dreadful nature of this

punishment is concerned. Of course I am unable to see how or why it could be, that neither Jesus nor his disciples have taken any pains to correct the common opinion in relation to this subject, provided it was inconsistent with the truth. A pious fraud in concealing such a truth we cannot admit. It does not comport with their character. Deficiency of sympathy and kind feeling we cannot admit; for there is no evidence of this, but of the contrary. I must conclude, therefore, that they saw nothing important to correct in the common belief respecting this matter. I fully believe that what they have taught, all goes to confirm this belief.

I may in justice to my subject further say, that the efforts of those who *deny* the doctrine of endless misery, seem in the main to be directed merely toward assailing the texts brought forward by their antagonists in order to confirm the contrary opinion. What does this shew, but a consciousness that *appearances* at least in the Bible are very much against them, and that they have no good chance of maintaining their own standing, unless they can successfully assail the texts adduced by their antagonists?

Any one who is conversant with the tracts and books which are almost daily making their appearance in defence of *universal salvation*, must have been struck with the boisterous manner and overweening confidence with which arguments in favour of this doctrine are generally advanced. There is an air of positivity and a bold assumption of certainty, which is rarely found in any other class of theological disputants, that characterize most of the champions of this dogma. In what light are we to view all this? I have often remarked, that some men are positive, and obtrusive, and confident in their opinions, and noisy in the expression of them, either with a design to impose them by a kind of force upon others, or else to conceal from themselves and others the secret doubts which all the while are agitating their own breasts in regard to what they maintain. With most of the productions of Universalists that have met my eye, for these some years, I am disposed to think the latter is the case. When a sober man, by studying a subject thoroughly, has become so far acquainted with it as to know what he should believe, and on what grounds he rests his belief; when, moreover, he is thoroughly satisfied that those grounds are stable, and will abide the test of attack or scru-

tiny; it is not usual for him to swagger respecting his convictions, nor to boast of their certainty and firmness, nor to flout or leer at every thing which is suggested against them. Soldiers are wont to say, that the men who talk most of their courage and prowess in the retirement of a camp, are very apt to fall in the rear on the field of battle. Men of calm, cool, deliberate, unostentatious courage, it is expected, will execute the command to charge with the bayonet, while men of a different stamp will turn pale and tremble, when the bullets begin to whistle.

So, I am apt to think, is it with most of the champions of Universalism. Did they feel that they were well armed and well manned for the contest, they would not, like the Persian and Turkish arrays of battle, rend the heavens and earth, at the onset, with the clamour of voices and the din of arms, in order to frighten the ranks of opposers. Conscious possession of truth, in an honest cause, is wont to stand firm and collected, knowing its ultimate resources, and well persuaded too that noise is not argument, nor confident assertions reasoning.

In fact, there is no more suspicious mark of weakness in a combatant, than swaggering and obtrusive confidence. And if this be so, is there not reason to believe, that most of those who attempt to prove the doctrine of Universal Salvation from the Bible, do, after all, feel that they are labouring to obscure the Scriptures, not to say, pervert them, rather than to educe their simple and plain meaning?

It is wrong to judge any class of men with rigour, and I would not willingly do it; but I hope they will bear with me, in this case—they, I mean, on whom my remarks fall—when I honestly state the impression which their manner of *theologizing* makes upon me. If I am singular, or in the wrong, I hope I shall be forgiven for the apparently uncharitable views that I have expressed. That I am *singular*, cannot be true; to my certain knowledge it is not. That I am *in the wrong*—I shall believe, when I become convinced that the Bible teaches the doctrine of Universal Salvation.

The attempts at *philology*, which some of our fellow citizens of the class named often exhibit; the shew of learning, the parade of *αἰών* and עוֹלָם, and of declarations respecting them which shew that the mere elements of critical study are not mastered; the descants on the foreign languages of

Greek and Hebrew, by those to whom they are still altogether *foreign;* may provoke the smile, or the disgust, of one who has studied those languages more thoroughly, but they can make but little progress towards *convincing* him. When will men learn, that reason and not noise, that science and not ignorance, that patient and protracted investigation and not hasty and *a priori* assertion, are the appropriate means of convincing and winning over their fellow men? I know of no class in our country, who have more to learn in regard to this, than some of the Universalists.

But unhappily, while these truths are not denied in theory, or at any rate ought not to be, it seems only to spur on some champions to more adventurous dabbling with this subject. They must needs keep up the shew of learning, in order to preserve appearances. And so we have books on *αἰών* and עוֹלָם, those two refractory and *unsubduable* words that give so much trouble to some, written by men who cannot even frame to pronounce rightly the very words themselves, and who would be irretrievably puzzled to distinguish between some of the letters of the Hebrew and Greek alphabets. What kind of a cause must that be, which calls for and admits such advocates and such efforts as these?

But our weariness of so much noise, accompanied by so little argument and fairness of mind, should not prevent an examination of the subject before us, in a candid, serious, patient manner. If it be true that all men will be saved, it is one of the most interesting truths, in some respects the most interesting truth, ever published to our guilty and sinful race. It is worthy of proclamation through heaven, earth, and hell. It places the whole of the divine government, counsels, and proceedings, on a basis entirely different from that on which they are commonly supposed to rest, and would oblige us literally to begin anew the study of the Bible and the study of Theology. To this no rational man should object, provided his mind can be satisfied of the need of it. Let us welcome truth, from whatever quarter it may come; for truth is eternal; and not only so, but the old adage, *Magna est veritas et prævalebit,* should be most heartily assented to. Yet methinks there is something more than obtrusive and confident assertion, or reckless and drivelling criticism, or noisy contumely and coarse jesting, necessary to convince intelligent minds that we are actually to

begin anew on this subject. When is the question to be calmly, intelligently, kindly, and fairly discussed? I will not say, *Never;* for I would hope that better things than we have seen in our day, are yet to come. Still my fears are, that when a man has once tampered with his conscience and his Bible so much, as to become a convert to the views in question, fairness and candour are not to be expected of him. But I would fain indulge the hope that there are, even now, at least some who are better than my fears would represent them to be. At all events, it is painful to me, in the extreme, to speak as I have now spoken; and those who are offended by it, for such there doubtless will be, can, notwithstanding this, learn from this honest and open avowal of my feelings, what impression their writings make on at least a part of their opponents. While they are indignant at my declarations, they may still learn, perhaps, in future to avoid with more skill the giving offence to others who think as I do, and whom they are desirous to win over to their own party. In the end, therefore, this apparent evil may prove to be at least a real good to them. Nor should I omit to say, that on reviewing what I have now said they will find, that my remarks are not without restriction or discrimination.

The Universalists, it seems, are divided and dividing, among us, into two classes or sects. The one, as yet much the minority among *professed* Universalists, believe in future punishment, but not in *endless* punishment; and so they are called *Restorationists* by many. The other party "go for the whole," as the phrase is, and deny that there is any pun ishment in a future world. All that is to be suffered, and indeed (as some maintain) even all that is threatened by the Scriptures, is merely evil or punishment in the present world.

It would be difficult, perhaps, in surveying the past history of Christianity, in all its professed forms, to find any one of them all, either in ancient or modern times, which does so much violence to the Scriptures as this last named opinion. I have long since come to a full persuasion, that it is useless to attempt argument with men of this class. The truth is, there is no basis on which we can take our stand in common with them, so that we may have a chance to erect a better building than theirs. If the Bible does not

teach some *future* retribution of the wicked, then it cannot be fairly said to teach any thing; for on no subject whatever is Scriptural language plainer or more explicit than on this. We can make the appeal therefore to Scripture, with no ground of hope that it will be of any avail, when a man discards all its declarations respecting the *future* retribution of the wicked. And if we cannot appeal to the Scriptures at all, then of what use is it to attempt argument? Pure Deism might, indeed, as it often has, maintain that God will make future retribution; but as the immortality of the soul itself can merely be rendered probable by the light of nature, we cannot well suppose that future punishment can be fairly *proved* by it. So we have no way in which we can come at materials for convincing our opponents, on a question like that before us. I am fully persuaded, therefore, that in general it is best not to make the attempt at persuading them, in the way of polemic discussion.

In fact it has often seemed to me, that the mind is as it were undone, in respect to fairness and candour, when a man has once committed such violence upon it as deliberately to reject or pervert the declarations of the Bible, in regard to future retribution. There are no skeptics among us, of any sort that can be named, who do not seem to be easier brought to give a fair hearing to argument and reason, than the thorough Universalist of the lowest order. Fact seems to shew, that Deists, and even Atheists, may be more easily won than these. I hope this representation is not correct; but so far as any knowledge or observation of mine goes, I deem it to be strictly so. And if this be the case, there is presented a curious problem to be solved, in regard to such a phenomenon; one, I may add, of deep and painful interest.

I have heard of many persons being converted, on a dying bed, to a belief in future punishment, who had all their lives maintained the contrary doctrine; never yet have I heard of one who, in the like situation, was converted from the common belief to that of thorough Universalism. How is this to be explained? If it be indeed a gospel-truth, that all men are to be saved from every degree of future punishment, then why should not the Spirit of God put his seal on this most important truth, and bring it out to the world from the lips of the dying, by whom it had not previously been professed?

I do not state, that no *professed* Universalists do not die in the faith which they have adopted while living; but only that I never heard of a person, who had rejected their doctrines aforetime, that was brought, on his death-bed, to believe in it. Of course I do not make the absolute assertion (how could I prove it?), that there never was any such person. Still, inasmuch as I have never heard or read of such an one, it has been a matter of serious consideration with me, how such a phenomenon can be explained. We should expect that God would put his seal on such an important doctrine, provided it is true, by the triumph that it would give to his children in a dying hour. And yet, of all the dying-beds by which I have stood, I have never witnessed any thing of this nature.

My conviction is, that a mind, in the attitude of thorough belief in Universalism, is not to be won, except by the application of truths contained in the Gospel, different from those which respect the *when* and the *where* of punishment. And if so, dispute directly on this point would seem to be of little avail; inasmuch as the most plain and direct declarations of the Scriptures are not admitted. Still, I am aware how easily injustice may be done, by making any declaration of this nature without exception or limitation. I would hope, at least, that such is not the case with all who are professedly among the most thorough class of Universalists.

In respect to the other class or *Restorationists*, justice would require some change of tone and representation. There are indeed among them, men of like temperament and demeanour with those already characterized. But there are not a few of a different character, and whose doubts and difficulties are entitled to kind and respectful consideration. Not a few persons in our community secretly belong to this class. They perceive the extravagant and obtrusive assumptions of those who deny any future punishment; and, fearing to encourage them in their error, they withhold the expression of their own doubts and difficulties, guarding themselves at the same time from expressing and inculcating any positive belief in the doctrine of endless punishment. Thus they live, and perhaps die, without ever making any explicit avowal of their secret belief, or at least of their secret doubts. And among these are not a few of the professed preachers of the Gospel.

It were easy to prefer accusations, in this case, of insincerity and the want of open and honest dealing; and this is sometimes done. To such accusations, indeed, there are some who would be justly subjected. But I am not persuaded that all doubters of this class are to be taxed with hypocrisy and double dealing. There are minds of a very serious cast, and prone to reasoning and inquiry, that have in some way come into such a state, that doubt on the subject of *endless* punishment cannot, without the greatest difficulty, be removed from them.

They commence their doubts, it is probable, with some *a priori* reasoning on this subject. 'God is good. His tender mercy is over all the work of his hands. He has no pleasure in the death of the sinner. He has *power* to prevent it. He knew before he created man, and made him a free agent, that he would sin. In certain prospect of his endless misery, therefore, his benevolence would have prevented the bringing of him into existence. No father can bear to see his own children miserable without end, not even when they have been ungrateful and rebellious; and God, our heavenly Father, loves us better than any earthly parent does or can love his children.

'Besides; our sins are temporary and finite; for they are committed by temporary and finite beings, and in a world filled with enticements both from without and from within. It is perfectly easy for Omnipotence to limit, yea to prevent, any mischief which sin can do; so that the endless punishment of the wicked is unnecessary, in order to maintain the divine government and keep it upon a solid basis. Above all, a punishment *without* end, for the sins of a few days or hours, is a proportion of misery incompatible with justice as well as mercy. And how can this be any longer necessary, when Christ has made atonement for sin, and brought in everlasting redemption from its penalty?'

The social sympathies, too, of some men, are often deeply concerned with the formation of their religious opinions. They have lost a near and dear friend and relative by death; one who never made any profession of religion, or gave good reason to suppose that his mind was particularly occupied with it. 'What shall they think of his case? Can they believe that one so dear to them has become eternally wretched—an outcast for ever from God? Can they en-

dure the thought that they are never to see or associate with him any more? Can heaven itself be a place of happiness for them, while they are conscious that a husband or a wife, a son or a daughter, a brother or a sister, is plunged into a lake of fire from which there is no escape? It is impossible, they aver, to overcome such sympathies as these. It would be unnatural and even monstrous to suppress them. They are therefore, as they view the case, constrained to doubt whether the miseries of a future world can be endless.'

If there are any whose breasts are strangers to such difficulties as these, they are to be congratulated on having made attainments almost beyond the reach of humanity in the present world; or else, to be pitied for ignorance, or the want of a sympathy which seems to be among the first elements of our social nature. With the great mass of thinking Christians I am sure such thoughts as these must, unhappily for them, be acquaintances too familiar. That they agitate our breasts as storms do the mighty deep—will be testified by every man of a tender heart, and who has a deep concern in the present and future welfare of those whom he loves.

It would seem to be from such considerations, and the like to these, that a belief in a *future* repentance and recovery of sinners has become so wide-spread in Germany, pervading even the ranks of those who are regarded as serious and evangelical men in respect to most or all of what is called orthodox doctrine, saving the point before us. Such was the case, also, with some of the ancient fathers; and such is doubtless the case with not a few of our day, who are far removed from noisy and obtrusive sectarianism, and who even do not venture positively to assert and maintain the modified doctrine of universal salvation, namely, the *final* restoration of all to divine favour, after punishment and repentance.

Can we find it in our hearts severely to reproach doubters of this retired and modest class; who will not even venture to assert what they hope is true, and on the whole do believe to be true, for fear that it may not after all prove to be so, and then the assertion of the doctrine might lead others to ruin? No, we should not so demean ourselves in respect to serious and also anxious and distressed minds, filled with doubts which they have yet found no adequate grounds to

satisfy. Their state of mind may be *wrong*. I must believe that it is. But theirs is an error of quite a different character from that of an obtrusive and contumacious renunciation of all belief in any future retribution.

It is foreign to my design, and beyond my present limits, to go into a discussion of the particular grounds already mentioned, which are alleged in support of the opinion that future punishment is *temporary*. In the most summary manner to glance at a few considerations on which the mind ought most seriously to reflect, is all that I can be permitted to do.

If the doctrine of future existence, i. e. the *certainty* of this doctrine, be dependent on *revelation* for its support—and this I must on the whole believe—then it follows, that all we can know of future happiness or misery with certainty, must be from the declarations of Scripture, or from legitimate consequences drawn by fair reasoning from those declarations.

Now it is palpable, at first view, that most of the doubts and difficulties suggested above, are such as arise from reasoning in the main independently of the Scriptures. That God is good, kind, merciful, compassionate, paternal—is true beyond all doubt. That he is *just* also, is equally true. Nor do I suppose his justice, truth, compassion, or any other attribute of such a quality, is different in its nature from the like attributes in ourselves; for we are made *in his image*, and we can have an idea of his moral attributes only by reasoning from an analogy with our own, and then separating from those attributes, as existing in him, all idea of imperfection. But still, there is one most important and fundamental consideration, in respect to this whole matter, which does not seem to be properly regarded by doubters of the class in question. This is, that God superintends the concerns of a UNIVERSE; and that all things, present, past, and future, are all perfectly before him. It is such a being, and such an one only, who is capable of judging what particular thing or measure is conducive to the highest good of the whole. It is only such a being who can judge, where the safe and proper bounds of mercy are to be placed, and how far the right and power of pardon shall be exercised. Even an earthly government, that should exercise indiscriminately the right of pardon, would be deemed weak, ineffi-

cient, yea, contemptible, inasmuch as this would be merely bidding up a bounty for transgression of the laws. Must not God's moral government maintain the honour and dignity of his laws?

You will answer in the affirmative. *Some* punishment must be inflicted. But then—*endless* punishment! O that dreadful thought! *Endless* misery for *finite* crime!

True; it is a dreadful thought. All punishment is dreadful in a greater or less degree, else it would not be punishment. But tell me: Can any one, except the omniscient God, unfold or even understand the *extent* of the evils occasioned by sin? It must be true that no one can do this except He.

If then, in his Law, he has actually affixed such a penalty to sin, what are we to believe? That it is just, or unjust? It is a plain case of duty here, to acquiesce in his judgment and decision. The question turns, then, simply on what he has decided in his word.

As to *endless* punishment, do not our State Governments immure criminals for life? May not punishment continue as long as sinning? And is it just that our civil government should exercise such a power? If you concede this point, why may it not be true, that the Supreme Governor of the Universe may immure in the *State Prison* of the Universe (if I may be allowed so to speak), such as cannot be permitted to go at large without jeoparding the order, harmony, peace, and happiness of the *Universe?* Can we be the proper judges of what is necessary to preserve and promote these in all their extent and mutual relations? Or must He, of necessity, be the only *competent* judge?

The appeal is made, moreover, and often with thrilling effect too, to parental feelings, and the question asked, 'Would you be willing that a child of yours should become for ever miserable?' The first and spontaneous answer is—No! No! 'How then can God be willing that any of his children should be for ever miserable?' He is not, in one sense. He has no pleasure in it. He has sworn that he has none. But this does not decide the point, that, as a legislator and governor and judge, he may not feel obliged to inflict such a punishment. Supposing an earthly parent to be fully and on good grounds assured that a prodigal son will never reform, and that he will use all the efforts possible

to corrupt the rest of his family—is such a father justified in retaining such a child in his own house? Surely there are cases, many cases, where he could not be justified, but must cast him out, in order that the peace and happiness of the innocent should be secured. Cannot God judge better than we, when this ought to be done; and can any one but He decide on the propriety and necessity of doing it?

'But God has *power* to make all men happy; how then can his benevolence permit any to be for ever miserable?'

God has *power*, I answer, to make all happy, both here and hereafter, so far as *omnipotence* is concerned. He can make and unmake worlds by a single word. But if the possession of such a power confers obligation on benevolence to save from *all* misery (and this is the very gist of the argument), then why does his benevolence actually permit sin and misery in this world? It will not be called in question, that this world is full of both.

But we may go a step farther. To talk of mere *power*, in such a case, does not seem to be saying much to the purpose. There is a harmony, a consistency, a complete congruity, in the divine character and attributes. God has determined to create moral beings, and to place them under a moral government as free and responsible agents. He looks on this as a plan which infinite wisdom and goodness must adopt. If now he should use his simple omnipotence so as to defeat a part of the plan of moral government and retribution which he has devised, then he would array one part of his attributes against another. He cannot, *consistently with his plan of governing the world*, make any free rational agents happy, who are sinners, so long as they remain impenitent. He could, so far as his *power* is concerned, unmake them, and create new and holy beings in their stead. But his wisdom and his goodness have not led him to adopt such a plan of government. When we say that *God can do this* or *can do that*, we should always say so with the express understanding, that all his attributes in their harmonious relation, and also the nature of the government which he has adopted, permit him to do this or that *consistently*.

Who shall judge, now where pardon may be safely extended—and beyond which the general good will not permit it? I know of none but God who can judge. Why then should we suppose ourselves to be within the limits of pro-

priety or safety, when we undertake to decide this question for Him?

So might I reason, in regard to most of the difficulties suggested. They are in fact either doubts or decisions savouring of presumption, and grounded on our limited, imperfect, and often unreasonable, sympathies. They depend too, in great part, on our *a priori* speculations about the best means of accomplishing the highest happiness and the greatest good. Alas! how often do we suffer ourselves to be drawn away, and led into error, by the very *limited* views and wishes that we entertain!

One remark more and I have done with this part of the subject. One of the most impressive of all the objections felt and made against endless misery, is, that, as many seem to hold and teach the doctrine, *it represents all future punishment as undistinguishing and of equal severity.*

I readily acknowledge that the subject may be so treated as to make such an impression. If, for example, only one expression, or one image employed by the sacred writers, be set before the minds of those who are uninstructed, and this without any explanation, such an impression may easily be made. I will suppose a preacher to speak habitually of hell merely as a lake of fire, and to convey the idea that this expression is to be *literally* understood, and give no explanations; then will it not be almost a matter of course, that many of his hearers will suppose he means to teach a kind of *equality* of punishment in a future world, and an equality which involves the idea of most aggravated torture appointed for the least as well as the greatest of sinners? All, as the matter is represented, are cast into the same lake without distinction. How then can the punishment of one differ from the punishment of another?

Such a question a teacher of this class ought naturally to expect. But another teacher, who has effectually learned, that all language borrowed from the *material* world and appropriated to the description of a world which is *immaterial* and *spiritual*, must of necessity be taken in a modified or tropical sense; who, at the same time, takes pains to inculcate on the minds of his hearers the *scriptural* idea, that every one will be rewarded according to his works, and that punishment will never exceed the measure of crime, and always will keep pace with it—such a teacher may avoid any

grounds of just objection in respect to the matter before us. At all events, the *whole* doctrine of the Bible, in relation to this matter, should be taught, and then there is no room in reality for the objection to be made which we are considering. Future punishment, inflicted by *divine* justice which is not fallible, never can exceed the measure of guilt.

Cannot divine justice render the sinner miserable, so long as he continues to be a sinner, i. e. so long as he remains impenitent? Can there not be ends answered by this, of which we are not now, and cannot be, proper judges? Is it not true, that God only is able to foresee all the consequences resulting from sin, and from the *continued* punishment of it? Is it not true, that he will never punish too severely?

It will be admitted, I trust, by candid and reasoning men, that in the nature of things, as the world is constituted, sinners cannot be happy without being brought to repentance. It follows from their very nature, while sinning and impenitent, that they are *incapable* of the happiness of heaven.

The whole question then turns, at last, on the simple point, whether *repentance* in a future world is a doctrine of Scripture. Independently of the Scriptures it will not be contended, that we can establish any thing wholly *satisfactory*, in respect to this deeply interesting question.

Do the Scriptures then teach such a doctrine? I am unable to find it. I know of but one text to which the sober expositors of Scripture are wont to appeal with confidence, when they attempt to defend the affirmative of this question. This is 1 Pet. 3: 18—20, where the apostle speaks of Christ's "going and preaching to the spirits in prison, which were sometime [formerly] disobedient," i. e. in the days of Noah, and before the flood. Is there ground here, for such an important conclusion as they deduce from this text?

If so, then several things would seem to follow:

(1) That only the antediluvians, certainly among the most wicked of all men, enjoyed the proffers of salvation in a future world, through the preaching of Christ; for only these are included in the passage. (2) It was only the Spirit that *quickened* Christ (according to our English version), which sent or enabled him to go and preach to the spirits in prison. How this *life-giving* Spirit (life-giving in the natural sense) is *appropriately* spoken of as accomplishing such a work through Christ, I am unable to see. And how Christ,

in his own spirit, could be *made alive* [ζωοποιηθείς], in the natural sense of the words, I am not aware. Was his *spirit* mortal, like his body, and therefore *quickened* for the work of preaching in Hades? But, (3) Understanding *quickened* (ζωοποιηθείς) here as applied merely *to Christ's own spirit*, and that the Spirit of God is not brought to view (which many take to be a fair construction, although our translation gives a different view), then in what sense is it said: *By which* [spirit] *he went and preached to the spirits in prison?* When the writer had already mentioned, that Christ was *put to death in the flesh* was there need of telling us immediately, that not his *flesh* but his *spirit* went and preached to those in prison? There is, at all events, something exceedingly strange in this passage, or (to say the least) very unusual, if such be its meaning. If, however, we understand the passage, as our translators did, of the Spirit of God who dwelt in Christ, and made him to triumph over death—that same Spirit who moved Noah to preach, "when the longsuffering of God" bore with the antediluvians, we shall have, at least, an intelligible sense of the passage, if not a satisfactory one. (4) Not a word is said here, in case we maintain that Christ did preach to the spirits in prison, and while they were in prison, of their *conversion* and *repentance;* so that, at all events, no positive aid can be elicited from this passage, in behalf of the position that there will be repentance in a future world. If the question be urged: Would Christ have preached in vain? The answer is easy: Not altogether in vain, if indeed he did preach; *some* good end would doubtless be answered, although we may not be able to tell what it was. But Christ preached to many thousands of Jews, during his incarnation, who were never brought to repentance; so that we cannot deduce from the fact that Christ preached to the spirits in prison, the conclusion that they were brought to repentance by his preaching.

I do not assume the position, that I have given a satisfactory exegesis of the passage before us, nor hold out the show of being able to give one. It is unquestionably one of the most difficult passages in all the Bible, and depends for its solution, as I apprehend, on some popular views common at the time when Peter wrote his epistle, but which are not known to us. One thing, however, is plain: Can we build

our hopes for eternity on such a doubtful passage as this? Does not the passage itself show, if it be interpreted as affirming the preaching of Christ to the spirits *while* in prison, that a *distinction* was made by him? For why did he preach only to Antediluvians? This last question presents, indeed, a difficulty which is well nigh fatal to such an exegesis; for why should all the heathen world, that never heard the Gospel, be excluded from the offers of repentance and salvation, while the Antediluvians, who were much more wicked, enjoyed the privilege of such an offer?

Where else besides this as yet slippery ground, shall we find a stand in the Scriptures for the advocates of future repentance? It is easy enough to say that the thing ought to be so, and must be so, and to assume it on grounds *a priori*; but we are, and for very good reasons, concerned at present only with the Bible.

I must merely cast a look at two or three passages of Scripture, and then withhold my hand; for on any other ground I should be forced to write a *book*, instead of a short communication adapted to this Miscellany.

Deeply anxious, nay distressed, as my mind has sometimes been, on this awful subject, and eagerly intent on every species of evidence which seemed to have a bearing upon it, I have never yet been able to see how we can fairly dispose of some few passages of the Bible that remain, even after we pass by all the contest which respects the meaning of *for ever*, and *for ever and ever*. I cannot do less than hint at some of these.

I do not indeed at all concede, that any advance has yet been made, toward showing that *for ever* and *for ever and ever* must or can have a mere *temporary* and *limited* meaning, when applied to future punishment. The moment which decides that they can, decides that God and heaven are temporary too; for the same qualifications are applied to them in regard to duration, as are applied to future punishment. Nor is it true, that the words εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, or עוֹלָם, or עוֹלְמֵי עוֹלָמִים, do not naturally mean *eternity* or *endless ages*. Whenever they have a different sense, if ever, it is only a metaphorical one. We speak of an *endless* recital, of an *everlasting* noise or din, with just the same modified meaning as the Hebrews did, when they applied the preceding words to any thing not strictly *eternal*. Yet nothing

could be more untrue than that *endless* and *everlasting* mark, in and by themselves, only a temporary existence.

Passing by all this, for the present, as I must do, there are difficulties in the way of penitence and restoration in a future world, which I have never been able to remove, and which I shall propose to the serious consideration of others.

In the 20th chapter of the Revelation, John represents himself as seeing in vision the sea and the grave giving up the dead for a general judgment; in other words, he presents the doctrine of a general resurrection and a general judgment, at the final close of all things, i. e. after the material heavens and earth have passed away, and a *new* heaven and a *new* earth are created; Rev. 20: 1—15. Here, at the close of this awful scene, "those whose names are not written in the book of life," i. e. all impenitent sinners, are represented as "cast into the lake of fire, which is the SECOND DEATH."

So then, after the material heavens and earth are passed away, there is a judgment; and by that judgment the wicked are sentenced to undergo the SECOND DEATH. And what is this? The *first* death is not of a permanent and enduring nature. The resurrection removes the effects it had produced, and reanimates the bodies which it had dissolved. But what is the *second* death? Is there a resurrection from this? We read, it is true, in Rev. 20: 6, of a *first* resurrection; but this *precedes* the Millennium; the *second* resurrection, therefore, must be the final and general one, or is there another still? That seems to be out of question; for the body and soul, the original elements of our nature, *both* have existence after the second resurrection. Is there no room then for a third? None; certainly none in any apposite sense of the word *resurrection*.

What then is the *second* death, but a death that is to be followed by no resurrection? I cannot conceive of any other appropriate meaning to be attached to it. It is a death which is never to die, i. e. never to cease or to be followed by life. Not a death of the wicked in a *natural* or *physical* sense; for they are raised up so as to be immortal; but death in a *spiritual* sense, i. e. a state of misery, and one which admits of no end, inasmuch as no resurrection from it is disclosed.

But we are met here with a difficulty; yea, with even a

claim that a contrary opinion is established by the context of the passage under consideration. This is, that "*death* and *hell* are said to be cast into the lake of fire, which is the second death," Rev. 20: 14. 'If *death* himself who is the messenger that summons sinners to the world of wo, and *hell* which is the place where they are tormented, are both destroyed, i. e. cast into the lake of fire, then, it is asked, how can there be any further punishment of sinners?'

As this shape of the argument, if argument it may be called, has often been adduced and urged, it may be expedient to say a few words upon it.

The *figurative* style of the Apocalypse all will be ready to concede, who have read it with any attention. To every thing life and animation is given, by the imagination of the writer; and not unfrequently even to objects which in themselves are inanimate. *Personification* is every where to be found in the book, i. e. objects in themselves incapable of speaking or acting, are represented as doing both.

As a proof of this, the reader needs only to turn to Rev. 6: 8, where, of the dread array that march forth to the contest in behalf of the Messiah's Kingdom, *Death* and *Hell* (*θάνατος καὶ ᾅδης*) are represented as constituting a part. There it is plain that death is *personified;* and in the same manner that Hades also is. But what is *Hades* in this case? Is it the *place* of the dead, or is it a collective noun, designating the *under-officers* (so to speak) by whose aid Death is imagined to manage the affairs of his realm? The latter sense seems plainly to be the only appropriate one here: for with what congruity could the writer represent Hades as a *place* following in the train of this fearful array?

Transfer now these plain and simple elements of the apocalyptic style of representation to the passage before us. First, the sea is represented as giving up its dead, that they may go to judgment. Then Death and Hades, whose domains were conceived and spoken of by the Hebrews as being *subterranean*, are spoken of as yielding up their dead for the same purpose. In other words, the king and princes of the Under-world yield up their dead, at the summons of the last trumpet. In plain and simple words: The resurrection is universal.

But now, as the king and princes of the Under-world are only poetic or fictitious persons, how can it be said of them

that they are "cast into the lake of fire, which is the second death?" Plainly this is neither more nor less than a consistency of representation *carried through.* Having, in the body of his work (see Rev. 6: 8), spoken of Death and Hades as *agents* or *persons*, the writer here carries through this bold idea, and represents them as finally cast into the lake of fire, from which there is no escape; of course they can never issue from it to commence their ravages or exercise their dominion any more.

Such appears to be the simple object of this representation. If the reader has any doubts in respect to it, let him turn, for a moment, to what Paul says, in regard to the closing scene at the judgment day. In 1 Cor. 15: 24 seq. he represents the end [το τέλος] of all things as arrived. Christ will now complete his triumph over *all* his enemies. Verse 26th tells us, that "the last enemy which shall be *destroyed*, (καταργεῖται, *rendered inactive* or *inefficient*), is death." Accordingly, at the close of this sublime representation, after the glorious resurrection of the saints, he represents them as triumphantly singing: "O death, where is thy sting? O Hades where is thy victory?" 1 Cor. 15: 55. In other words, when the final judgment comes the power of death henceforth ceases, i. e. it is subdued and conquered.

In consonance with this representation is that in Heb. 2: 14 seq. Christ, by his death, is there said "to *destroy* (καταργῆσαι) him that had the power of death, i. e. the devil."

In this passage, respect is had merely to Christians; but still the representation is for substance the same as in the text under investigation. The power of death is overcome, and ceases.

In all three of the passages the idea is prominent, that the power of death is, at the consummation of all things, to come to a final end. But in the passage before us, the poetical expression comprises death and his auxiliaries, called Hades by the writer. So we say familiarly, *Great Britain* for the King and Parliament, putting *place* or *country* for those who live in it and possess it. In the Apocalypse, Death and Hades are plainly considered as the possessors or lords of the Under-world; phraseology borrowed from the popular modes of speech prevalent among the Jews, as any one may see who will carefully read Isaiah XIV.

Consider now the result. The wicked are cast into the

lake of fire; and their torment is the second death. The first death, i. e. a dissolution of their bodies, or the destruction of their physical feeling and sensitive powers, has done his work, and never can resume it. He cannot come to the relief of those who are cast into the lake of fire. They find, indeed, that *it is not all of death to die*, i. e. that the first death may be followed by a second, which is unspeakably worse. Then will come to pass what was declared by the Saviour: "Better had it been for them, had they never been born."

If any should still insist, that Hades (Rev. 20: 14) must be interpreted as meaning *place;* then the only sense of which the passage seems to be susceptible is, that the abode of the wicked, *before* the general judgment, will, *after* that event, become a part of the lake of fire, or be added to it, so that the punishment may be more aggravated than before.

This is a meaning which has some claims to our consideration; and were it not for Rev. 6: 8, it is one which might easily be admitted. But in what way this would aid the sentiment, that repentance in a future world is a scriptural doctrine, cannot, I apprehend, be easily shown. The passage understood in either way, is fatal to hopes of such a nature.

One other passage must be briefly touched. It is in 1 Cor. xv. 24 seq. The apostle here represents the *end* as coming, when Christ will deliver up his mediatorial kingdom, after he has put all enemies under his feet. This accomplished, his mediatorial work is done; his embassy is completed; his mission therefore comes to an end. "The Son himself will be subject to Him who put all things under his feet, that God may be all in all," i. e. the mediatorial reign as such ceases, and God, as the Judge and Rewarder of men, and the Sovereign of all, reigns without any delegated dominion and without any limitation whatever.

What now may we justly deduce from this passage? Setting aside all the curious and difficult questions that might be asked respecting the *human nature* of Christ subsequently to this period, and other embarrassing inquiries which any tyro in Theology could raise, thus much lies on the face of this tremendous passage; for such we shall see it is. After the period in question, the *mediatorial* kingdom as such, and the mediatorial work, entirely cease. Christ has fulfilled his

whole mission as Mediator; and those enemies whom he has not reconciled by the blood of his cross, he has subdued. "All is put under his feet." All this conceded—what then is to become of sinners, doomed yet to undergo the second death? The *mediatorial* work is done. The office is resigned or given up. God only as lawgiver and king now reigns, and is all in all. And are those sentenced to the second death, to be redeemed without a Redeemer? Are they to be saved without a Mediator? Can such a work be done, when the only Being in the universe who could perform it has laid his office aside because it is completed? Will he send preachers to visit "the lake of fire, which is the second death," and proclaim glad tidings? Will he pour out his Spirit there? Will he cause the means of grace there to be more efficacious than they were during the season of probation? I do not find a hint in all the book of God about any such arrangement; there is surely no probability in itself considered, that a place of *punishment* will be more highly favoured than a place of *probation*.

How then are those under sentence of the second death to be brought to repentance? You may say: By punishment. But will punishment effect this, unaided by the other means of persuasion and reformation? Did Israel in the desert, when called to suffering, become penitent and humble? And when God is represented, in the Revelation, as pouring out his indignation upon the followers of the beast and the false prophet, do they repent? Rather, do they not blaspheme with a violence and a daring which are greatly aggravated? Who can shew, that simple misery, among the wicked, unattended with any means of grace, or any gift of the Spirit, or any of the usual means of gospel-salvation, will produce *penitence?* Have the fallen angels reformed? It is contrary to all experience; and therefore contrary to all probability.

On the whole, it would be difficult, as it seems to my mind, to find any passage in the Scriptures, which opposes with so irresistible a force the idea of redemption in a future world, as the one before us. It is only by affirming, that all which the apostle says, refers merely to what is done down to the end of time, and that nothing farther is revealed, or is intended to be revealed, that we can escape from the conclusion which is forced upon us. But what an escape

is this? To cast ourselves upon mere conjecture for the interests of an *eternity!* To assume as true, what we have no authority or support for in all the word of God! Can it be true, that if there is repentance in a future world, such an all-important sentiment would not have been plainly and repeatedly suggested by the mercy of a God, who takes no pleasure in the death of the wicked?

But enough for the present occasion. I have not even pretended to consider the subject at large, and could not do so in an essay like the present. I have endeavoured, in the first place, to give some hints as to what the views of the Jews were in relation to the subject of future punishment, during or near the apostolical age. These have been investigated, first of all, independently of the testimony in our canonical Scriptures. In the sequel, I have presented some considerations both from the nature of the case, and from the Scriptures themselves, to show why we should hesitate as to adopting the doctrine of the Restitutionists. Will these—can these—be fairly and candidly met and answered? Can the subject be discussed in a manner worthy of calm and impartial inquiry? I have read what Doederlein, and Hahn, and others, have advanced in favour of the doctrine of repentance after death; for these are calm and candid writers. But my own mind has not been satisfied with what they have advanced; nor can I think that others ought to be satisfied.

That the subject is one of fearful interest, none will deny who believe in future retribution. That there are difficulties pressed by it on the mind, when any one thinks of his own condition, that of his beloved friends, or of his brethren of the human race, it would be mere pretence to deny. But it is a consolation to believe, that behind any clouds, however dark, that interpose between us and the light of the sun, his beams still shine clearly. All will be clear in the light of heaven. If parents, husbands, wives, brothers, sisters, must see those dear as their own life perish at last, while they themselves are saved, heaven in mercy will either extinguish their social susceptibilities, or else give them such a sweet and overpowering sense of the justice and goodness of God, as shall not permit the joys of the blessed to be marred, nor the songs of the redeemed to be interrupted with sighs of sympathetic sorrow. *How* this will or can be

done, we may never know in the present world; nay, we may have many a distressing hour, while inquiring how it can possibly be done, unless our very nature itself is wholly changed. But the light of eternity will scatter these doubts, and the clear and uninterrupted vision of divine glory will fill the soul *with all the fulness of God;* so that the blessed above will find their perfect happiness in thinking and feeling as He does, into whose image they have been transformed.

ARTICLE II.

On the Designations of Time in Daniel and John:— The 1260 Days of Daniel and John, and the 1000 Years of John.

By Rev. William Allen, D. D., Norhampton, Mass.

Professor Stuart, in a learned article, published in the Biblical Repository and Quarterly Observer, for Jan., 1835, has endeavoured to prove, that the term *days*, in the prophecy of Daniel and of John concerning the 1260 days, has not the import of *years*, as is commonly supposed, but means literal days or an indefinite period; and that the 1000 years of John are also *indefinite.* In view of the fallibilities of man it must be admitted to be possible, that he has fallen into a mistake in these particulars, however correct in general he may be in the interpretation of Scripture. Persuaded that he has thus erred, and that his erroneous opinion on the designations of time in the prophecies is calculated to throw a cloud over the bright anticipations of the Church in respect to the near approach of the millennium, I propose to state the grounds, on which my mind has arrived at a different conclusion; and may find it necessary to examine the arguments, by which he has endeavoured to support his position.

In the Apocalypse, (12: 6,) we read, that the woman, clothed with the sun, etc., fled into the wilderness for "a thousand two hundred and threescore days;" and in verse 14th, the same period is expressed by "a time, and times, and

half a time," meaning three years and a half of days, or three times and a half 360, equal to 1260. So in Rev. 11: 2, it is predicted, that the Gentiles should tread the Holy City under foot "42 months;" and in Rev. 13: 5, that the beast should continue "42 months," equal to 1260 days.

In Daniel (7: 25,) it is predicted of the impious king, that he should continue "a time, and times, and the dividing of time;" and it is also predicted, that to the end of the wonders (12: 7,) is "a time, times, and an half;"—equal to 1260 days.

Now, as John and Daniel were inspired of God to predict the future, it seems altogether probable, that in both their writings this period is to be construed in the same way, and must mean in both either literal *days*, or literal *years*, or some *indefinite period*. Mr. Stuart thinks, that in Daniel *literal days* are intended, and in John an *indefinite time*. It is my object to prove, that in both, but certainly in John, neither literal days nor an indefinite time, but the exact period of 1260 *years* is intended.

1. To begin with DANIEL. In ch. 7: 25, it is predicted, that the saints are to be delivered into the hands of a persecuting power "until a time, and times, and the dividing of a time,"—which, I maintain, must mean a longer period, than 1260 literal *days*, and a different power from that of Antiochus, for this reason, that the universal establishment of the kingdom of the Most High is immediately to succeed that period. For the next verses are these, v. 26, 27, "But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end. And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." Antiochus, between 160 and 170 years before Christ, persecuted the Jews and polluted the temple for three years; but after his death no events occurred like those described in the passage just quoted. So far was religion from spreading through the world, that even the Jewish character was found, at the coming of Christ, very corrupt and debased, and true religion was almost extinct. How then can we imagine, that Antiochus is the persecuting power, here predicted, and that the period is 1260 literal *days?*

2. For a similar reason it may be maintained, that the prediction of "a time, times, and a half," as the end of the wonders (Dan. 12: 7), cannot mean 1260 literal days, or the short persecution of Antiochus; for it is added, "and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished." But surely, it cannot be pretended, that about 165 years before Christ, "the power of the holy people" ceased to be scattered. Even now the Jews are scattered over the earth, and the anti-Christian power of Rome is little less, than it has been for centuries.

3. In these two passages of Daniel the word *days* is not used, and the time designated may in strict philological propriety be understood 1260 *years*. All, that is expressed, is 1260 *divisions* of time, and those divisions must be regarded as *years* rather than *days*, provided there are any considerations, which render it more probable, that the prophet intended years and not days.

In a perfectly similar case, in the same writer, (Dan. 9: 24, "seventy weeks are determined on thy people,") even Mr. Stuart admits, that the meaning is 70 weeks of *years*, or 490 years, for he says, that the Hebrew word "designates only *heptade* or *heptades* [divisions of seven]; and whether these are sevens of years, or sevens of days, must be determined by the context and the nature of the case."

If Daniel, in speaking of the future in his 9th chapter, by the word *weeks*, or *heptades*, or *divisions* of *seven*, means a week of *years*, or seven years, is it not to be presumed, that in his 7th and 12th chapters, where he speaks of a *division* amounting to 1260, he must mean also so many *years?* If 70 weeks, amounting to 490 days, means 490 *years;* why, in the same writer, should not 3 1-2 times, amounting to 1260 days, mean also 1260 *years?* Is it probable, that Daniel in his 7th chapter would adopt one mode of reckoning; a different one in his 9th chapter; and revert in his 12th chapter to his first mode? When he is predicting the future, under the guidance of infinite wisdom and for the instruction of man, may we not rest satisfied, that he uses one and the same method of reckoning?

4. There is a historical difficulty in the application of the prophecy of 3 1-2 years, or 1260 days, to Antiochus. For by comparing Maccabees 1: 54, 59, and 4: 52, it appears that

the idol altar remained upon the altar of God precisely three years, and not 3 1-2 years. It appears also from Josephus, Antiq. 12, c. 5, § 4, and c. 7, § 6, that Antiochus held possession of the temple exactly three years, for he "got possession of the city" on the 25th day of the month *Chasleu*, and on the same day of the same month was the sacrifice re-established. Here is no use of "round numbers," as Mr. Stuart supposed, confining his attention to the passage of Josephus last referred to and overlooking the first. It may be, indeed, that Josephus was mistaken, for it is evident from the Maccabees, that the city was captured some time before the idol altar was set up; but whether this time was exactly six months is not mentioned, and may be difficult to be proved. It must be admitted, that Josephus, in his "Wars," states the time during which Antiochus held Jerusalem, at "three years and six months;" but whether he meant to be precise to a day is uncertain. The prophecy is precise,—1260 days. Nor should it be forgotten, that in his "Antiquities," in which he gives precisely three years, he professes to be exact; for he says in regard to Antiochus, "I will now give a particular account of what concerns this king, how he subdued Judea and the temple; for in my former work I mentioned those things very briefly, and have therefore now thought it necessary to go over that history again, and that *with great accuracy*." Ant. 12, c. 5, § 2.

5. There is also a historical difficulty in applying to Antiochus the 1290 and 1335 days, mentioned in Daniel 12: 11, 12. It will be remarked, that the period of 1290 exceeds that of 1260 by 30 days. Do these two periods *end* at the same time? Mr. Stuart supposes, that they do;—that 3 1-2 years or 1260 days are taken as the half of the sacred number seven, and are not designed to be definite, but are used in a popular, general way; but that 1290 days are specific, precise, exact, extending from the capture of Jerusalem by Antiochus to the purification of the temple. Yet there are no notes of time in any ancient historian, by which this number of days can be made out precisely.

Mr. Stuart also supposes, that the 1335 days do *not* end with the 1290, but relate to the time of the death of Antiochus, 45 days after the purification of the temple. For this exactness also there is no authority derived from the ancient historians. It is a mere supposition. The time of Antio-

chus' death is not designated. All, that we know, is, that he had heard, on the borders of Persia, of the defeat of his army in Syria, and was taken sick, and was sick for a considerable time. If this prophecy did relate to Antiochus, and of course has been fulfilled, should we not expect to find a precision and exactness, which would remove all doubt, as in the case of the 70 weeks or 490 years? Moreover, if the 1260 and 1290 days have a common ending, why should not the 1335 days end also at the same time? Why should not all the three periods either be successive, or have a common termination? But in either method, or in that of Mr. Stuart, there is an uncertainty in the application of these periods to Antiochus, not to be expected in an accomplished prophecy.

6. Even Mr. Stuart admits, that sometimes the Hebrew word for *days*, יָמִים, isused to denote *years*, as in Judg. 17: 10, 1 Sam. 2: 19, Ex. 3: 10, Is. 32: 10, comp. 29: 1,2 Chron. 21: 19. If, then, this word be sometimes thus used in Scripture in places not prophetic, why should it not be thus employed in prophetic passages? It is not enough to say, that prophecy ought to be plain. It may be, that God has designed it to be obscure in a degree until its fulfilment. And it may be added, that this use of the term *days* does not render prophecy more obscure, than some other parts of Scripture. Besides, the declaration of Jehovah to Ezekiel (Ez. 4: 4—6), "I have appointed thee each *day* for a *year*," might lead the careful student of prophecy to consider, that in other instances it might please God, in the communication of his will, to make use of *days* as symbolical of *years*.

7. If it should be admitted, that the 8th and 11th chapters of Daniel relate to Antiochus, and also Dan. 12: 11, 12; yet this admission will not necessarily affect the question as to the meaning of the 3 1-2 years, for the reasons assigned in § 3. Let it be, that whenever in Daniel the word *days* is used, it means literal days, this will decide nothing as to the import of other phrases, or designations of time, which have been considered.

The only specific note of time in Dan. 8th is 2300 *days*, in our translation; in Hebrew it is 2300 *evenings and mornings*. Mr. Stuart supposes, that this period extends from the murder at Tyre of three Jewish Deputies by Antiochus, in the year A. C. 170, to the purification of the temple, A. C. 164.

It is known, that the interval between these events was about six years. As to the 140 (Mr. S. says 14 by mistake) additional days required to make out the 2300, it is hypothesis, not history. The period might have been 2300; or it might have been only 2160 days, or six years.

If this passage relates to Antiochus, the following will perhaps be regarded as a more probable computation. The word *days* is not used, but *evenings and mornings.* One saint asked another, "How long shall be the vision concerning the *daily sacrifice*?" etc. Now, as the sacrifices were twice a day, in the evening and morning, the answer may have respect to the number of *sacrifices* to be interrupted, and that number being 2300, the number of days thus expressed is 1150, or three years and 70 days. This may be the period, to which Josephus refers in his "Wars," as already quoted, "three years and six months," provided he speaks generally, and not precisely to a day. If we look into the Maccabees, we find, that although it was precisely three years from the offering of sacrifice on the idol altar to the cleansing of the temple; yet that Antiochus, some short time *before* the establishment of idol worship, sent messengers to Jerusalem to forbid sacrifice in the temple. Mac. 1: 44. Now it is possible, that the *interruption* of the sacrifice was 70 days before the idol altar was used. Thus would be made out the 1150 days, or 2300 sacrifices interrupted.

The 11th chapter of Daniel has no computation of days or note of time.

The difficulty of applying a part of the notes of time in Dan. 12th, to Antiochus and a part to Anti-Christ is perhaps not insurmountable. In v. 5—8, the man on the banks of the river inquired of the man on the waters, how long it should be to "the end of these wonders;" referring to all that had been predicted as to the reign of Anti-Christ in the 7th chapter, etc. The answer is, "a time, times, and a half," or 1260 years.

Daniel understood not. But the Lord said to him, "the words are closed and sealed up till the time of the end;"—and then informed him, that there should be "1290 *days* from the removal of the sacrifice," and that he should be blessed, who should come to the "1335 *days*." That in these numbers literal days should be intended will depend upon the

application of a part of the prophecy in Daniel to Antiochus; and that a part should be applied to him and a part to Anti-Christ, is analogous to the methods of other prophets.

It is not my aim to prove this. But, supposing that Mr. Stuart and others are correct in applying these last numbers and the 8th and 11th chapters to Antiochus. There is nothing in the general character of the prophetical writings, there is nothing in the structure of the prophecy of Daniel to forbid us from regarding very different events as referred to by the *different numbers*, or expressions for numbers in other passages of the book of Daniel. Particularly, there is nothing to compel us to apply the "3 1-2 times" to Antiochus, but, on the contrary, strong reasons, which have been already assigned, for regarding the termination of that period as yet future.

8. The equivalent numbers in the Apocalypse are now to be examined. The passages are Rev. 11: 2, 3, 12: 6, 14, 13: 5, where the same period is expressed by the various terms or notations of "42 months," "1260 days," "a time, and times, and half a time." Surely no one will apply these passages to Antiochus; and as the number and the method of expressing it are the same in Daniel and John, it would seem probable, that the same event is referred to in both,—unless we should concur with some of the early Christian fathers in supposing, that Antiochus was designed to be a type of Anti-Christ, and that the literal *days* of the type are expanded into *years* in the antitype. But of the passages in the Apocalypse it is necessary to make a more particular examination.

In Rev. 11: 2, it is predicted of the Gentiles, "the holy city shall they tread under foot 42 months," which is equal to 1260 days. Here is a specific time, a precise, exact number; and this precision would seem to compel us to seek for the accomplishment of the prophecy either in 42 months of *days*, or months of *years*. The first question is, whether a *literal* treading under foot of Jerusalem is intended, or figuratively the oppression and persecution of the Christian religion? I cannot doubt, that the latter is intended, for it is more than 42 months of *years* since *Jerusalem* has been trodden under foot by the Gentiles.

war with the saints, should "continue forty-two months." He should have "power over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations." The event predicted is probably the same, as that of the persecution of the woman in the 12th chapter; and here again the wide-spread persecution and war against the saints in "all nations" oblige us to admit the reference, not to days, but to *years*, and to expect a future accomplishment of the prophecy.

12. We may well believe, that these four predicted events,—the treading under foot of the holy city—the prophesying in sackcloth of the two witnesses,—the abode of the woman in the wilderness,—and the continuance of the power of the persecuting beast,—have the same beginning and ending; that they are synchronous events, illustrating in these different ways the condition of the church during the long period so often mentioned.

Now, it may well be asked, whether it can easily be reconciled with the wisdom of God, that all these various but equivalent notations of time mean nothing definite, but something very uncertain, undefined? Were not the seventy *weeks* of Daniel precise and exact? Do not those, who apply the prophecy to Antiochus, admit, that the 1290 and 1335 *days* were precise and exact? How, then, can it be, that the remarkable prophecies in the Apocalypse are loose and indefinite?

That the sacred number seven is often used in the Apocalypse in an indefinite sense, as seven spirits, lamps, stars, golden candlesticks, etc. proves nothing in this case, for the number seven is not employed. If it should be said, that three and a half is the *half* of the sacred number seven, and may be employed in the same indefinite manner, or tropical manner; it may be replied, that because a certain number is sacred, and is used indefinitely, it by no means follows, that the *half* of that number is such, any more than that twice or any other multiple of that number is such. And that "three and a half years" mean a *precise* number seems very evident from the use of the equivalent 42 months, and 1260 days. Will any one pretend, that these numbers are employed tropically and indefinitely, because they are multiples of seven? This would be a refinement like that of Mr. Potter

and H. More, who consider 12 and its multiple 144 as indicative of the true church, and 25 and its multiple [not *exactly* such however] 666 as indicative of the Anti-Christian church.

13. The conclusion from all which has been said, is, that the 1260 days of John and the equivalent period in Daniel must mean the definite and precise period of 1260 years; and that the termination of those years is yet future. But against this conclusion some general objections, which may be gathered from Mr. Stuart's article, ought not to be overlooked.

In reference to Rev. 12th, he asks,—"Are we then to regard the church as *in the wilderness*, ever since the glorious light of the Reformation burst upon her; and the beast, and the false prophet as possessing completely desolating and crushing power over her? Let the ends of the earth respond to this, to which Protestants have long been sending the light of salvation. Let Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, America, the isles of the sea, answer and say, whether the beast and the false-prophet are able to crush them or send them into the wilderness; or whether persecuting power has not long since begun to hide its head and retreat from the predominating influence of the church, which bids defiance to all her enemies?" Bib. R. vol. V. p. 80.

But in reply to this, let it be considered, that when John wrote the Apocalypse, and for some centuries after, the gospel was unknown in the countries referred to by Mr. Stuart. In the first centuries of Christianity, and even up to the seventh century, where did the church exist in its beauty and glory? Doubtless in the countries around the Mediterranean sea, including parts of Africa, Asia, and Europe. And in all those countries,—in Egypt, in Syria, in Asia Minor, in Turkey, in Italy, in France, and Spain, is not the church *still* in "the wilderness," and *there* do not the beast and the false prophet retain still their "crushing power?" The reformation by Luther, extending its blessings to a part of Europe and to North America, has done nothing for the countries just mentioned. The toils of the Protestant churches in spreading the gospel in the distant regions of the earth, may be regarded as the very means of preparing for the full accomplishment of prophecy. The truth of God must be communicated to the world by the unwearied labors of man. At the appointed time, they shall "be destroyed, that destroy

the earth;" the power of error, delusion and tyranny will be suppressed; Babylon will fall; and all the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdoms of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Even Mr. S. says,—"The beast and the false prophet, i. e. heathenism and false religion, still bear sway over more than three quarters of our ruined race." p. 81. Is not this an admission, that the church is still in *the wilderness?* But if we should adopt a different construction, and suppose that "the beast and the false prophet" denote some particular form of false religion, as Romanism, both as a civil and spiritual power, then perhaps there will be, at a future time, in the utter overthrow of that power, a palpable and striking fulfilment of the prophecy.

14. Mr. S. remarks, "The men, who wrote prophecy, designed it to be read and *understood;* and, if they did, they wrote of course in an intelligible manner." p. 38. And he supposes, in particular, that the "notations of time in the Apocalypse were intelligible to John and his contemporaries." But on the construction, which Mr. S. gives to the Apocalypse, as the understanding of the apostle, John must have had very indistinct, indefinite notions as to the meaning of his own numbers. The numbers 3 1-2 years, 42 months, and 1260 days have already been adverted to. Another number in the Revelation is the "1000 years" of the reign of Christ, Rev. 20. 2—7. In regard to this number Mr. S. says, "A *long* period the writer plainly means to designate—a very long one. Nay, we may say in general, that the period of the church's prosperity is to be as much longer, than that of her adversity, as one thousand is more than 3 1-2. So much, I think, we may truly gather from the designation."—After stating, that the church has been, now and then, in deep affliction for 1800 years, he says, in reference to the time of her deliverance,—"Then the triumphs of redeeming love will bring home to glory such multitudes of our ruined race, that the number who may finally perish, will scarcely be thought of in comparison with the countless myriads of those, who will come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads." p. 82.

If then John had in view a period of the church's prosperity as much longer than 1800, as one thousand is more than 3 1-2 years, then that period will be more than 514,000 years.

One difficulty in the way of assenting to these views of Mr. S. is, that this period is so excessively long, that during the reign of peace, and temperance, and holiness, and the absence of many causes of human destruction for 514,000 years, this little globe must be overstocked with human beings. This objection does not lie so strongly to the interpretation which regards each year as expressing 360 years, as one *day* denotes 360 days, for on this construction we have the exact number 360,000 years, instead of the number 514,000 years. There is here a difference of the no small sum of 154,000 years in favor of taking the definite number, as we have it in John, supposing each year to stand for 360 years. Such in fact is the construction of some eminent men, who have written on the millennium; and their construction seems preferable to that, which, regarding the number as *indefinite*, yet maintains, that its lowest import is 514,000 years, while it may mean a much larger number.

15. But why need we suppose the "thousand years" of the reign of Christ to mean any thing more, than a thousand *literal years?* Is it because the phrase "a thousand" is often used in Scripture tropically and indefinitely, as in these instances, "the cattle on a thousand hills;—a day in thy courts is better than a thousand?" It is true, that there are instances of the use of the phrase thus indefinitely; but it is also true on the other hand, that there are many instances, in which the phrase is to be understood literally, as "of every tribe a thousand send to war," Numb. 31. 4. "Nabal had a thousand goats," 1 Sam. 2: 52. Also in the following places, Gen. 20: 16, Numb. 35: 4, Judg. 9: 49, 1 Sam. 18: 13, 2 Sam. 19: 17, 2 Kings 15: 19, 1 Chron. 19: 6, Job 42: 12, Ezek. 47: 3.

It is so also with the phrase "ten thousand." It is sometimes used indefinitely, as "ten thousand shall fall at thy right hand," and often definitely or literally, as "they slew of Moab ten thousand men," Judg. 3: 29, "he carried away even ten thousand captives," 2 Kings, 24: 14, etc.

There is nothing, therefore, in the customary use of the phrase, "a thousand," in other places, which will determine its import in the book of Revelation. The probability of its being used there indefinitely or definitely must be determined by examining the place itself, and from the nature of the case. If we suppose a year to mean 360 years, then the

probability is in favor of 360,000 years rather than 514,000, because the less number is definite, and is attended with less difficulty in regard to the overstocked population of the globe.

But why is it necessary to understand the "years" to mean any thing but literal years? Excepting in Rev. 20, the word *years* is not used in the book of Revelation, and almost without exception the word is used literally in other parts of the New Testament. The phrase "3 1-2 *years*," is not in the Apocalypse. Because the word *day* is used to denote a *year*, it does not follow, that the word year must mean 360 years, for the same prophetical writing may have periods both symbolical and literal. Indeed, if one period is symbolical of another, it would seem, that the last must be a literal period,—an exact, intelligible period. Thus the use of *days* as symbolical of *years* implies, that *years* is used in its common meaning.

16. It ought not to be overlooked, that the great body of commentators on the book of Revelation from the first century have understood the 1000 years to be literal years, however much they have differed in the assignment of those years in the course of time. Vitringa asks, "Quin imo, si Regno Christi Jesu in hisce terris danda sint feliciora aliqua et tranquilliora tempora, quam Ecclesia hactenus vidit; an probabile est, minore illa circumscripta fore spatio, quam *mille annorum?* Esse autem meliora tempora danda Regno Christi in his terris, clamant Prophetarum oracula; suadet ratio, et hoc fere tempore concedunt omnes, qui ad res divinas intelligendas animum suum admoverunt."

Circumstances may show which sense of the term *years* is employed; or the sense may be intentionally left doubtful in the wisdom of God, until thefulfilment clears up the mystery. Whether "years" be used literally, or symbolically for 360 years, is of no consequence in regard to the *beginning* of the millennium, which is the only matter of present interest to the church. But that a *precise* period, of the duration of the millennium, either exactly "1000 years," or exactly "360,000 years," is intended, seems to be indicated by the declaration, that after the end of the period, during which he is bound, Satan "must be loosed *a little season;*" by the 5th verse, "the rest of the dead lived not, *until* the 1000 years were finished;" by the 6th verse, "they shall be priests of

God and Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years," at the *end* of which Satan should be loosed out of prison, and should go out to deceive the nations.

It is sometimes thought, that if the exact year for the triumph of the cross was defined, the effect would be adverse to Christian effort. "Of what avail, then," it is asked, "would all efforts be, that might be made before the predicted period? This is an interpretation, which settles down the church upon her lees, until the destined year be ushered in." Bib. Repos. Vol. V. p. 82.

To this it may be replied, that as the beginning of the 1260 years is somewhat uncertain, so the time of its *ending* is also doubtful;—it may be as early as 1866; or it may be as late as 1925. But whether it be distant 30 years only, or 85 years, or more, to the beginning of the millennium, surely the comparatively small church, in seeing three quarters of the world, that is, 400 or 500 millions of men, still under the dominion of Satan, will find occasion enough for *all possible effort* in order to accomplish the conversion of the world even within one or two centuries. To this effort the greatest encouragement is, that the *time is near*, when the gospel shall triumph, and that God will assuredly attend the effort with his divine blessing.

If it be asked, "Why should Christians be made to believe, that before 1840, or 1847, or 1866, or 1875, or at any other definite period, no efforts will avail to bring in the Jews with the fulness of the Gentiles into the church of God?" And if it should be said, "They should not so believe. The millennium will come, when all the followers of Jesus will do their duty. This is the true Christian faith, which believes this and puts the principle in practice." p. 83. Perhaps a reply may be made in the following manner.

Whether or not a *definite* period for the beginning of the millennium be mentioned in Scripture, and revealed to man; yet doubtless in the mind and purpose of God a *definite* time *is fixed.* The thousand years' reign of Christ will not commence *before* the time which God has determined. In the view of Omniscience there can be no uncertainty as to this period, as there is no uncertainty in regard to any event whatever. The infallible promise is made to Christ, that he shall reign over all the earth; and the precise methods, by which his kingdom will be extended and established, are

ordained, and disclosed to us. If the time is fixed, why should not Christians believe this? God also has fixed the period of each man's death; no man will die before that time;—but can it be inferred, that the care of health and life is idle? Does not the same infinite wisdom, which contemplates the *end*, contemplate also the *means?*

The true way of stating the case may be this: The command of God binds Christians to the most strenuous *efforts*, and the most fervent, importunate *prayer* for the universal establishment of the kingdom of Christ in this world. This is their *duty*, whatever may be the *time* for the commencement of the millennium. Such was the obligation, resting on the primitive believers 1800 years ago. Such is the obligation which now rests upon believers.

But, although the duty be the same at all periods, yet the *encouragement*, the *animating motive* to Christians is *greater*, if they see the *signs* of the near overthrow of the enemies of the church, and of the near triumph of Christ's kingdom. And as the immense work of communicating the gospel to three quarters of the inhabitants of the world is a prerequisite to the reign of Christ,—is the indispensable means to this end;—and as the work must be accomplished by human agency and not by the agency of angels;—what believer, who is persuaded that the millennium is *nigh*, will not be roused to energetic toil and importunate prayer? It is now the crisis of the battle. The blow may now be struck; the enemy overthrown and put to flight. Who shall prove himself the traitor? Who shall shrink away from the contest? Who shall not go on with the great army, under Him, who goes forth "conquering and to conquer?" Who would not join the most certain shout of triumph?

There are some who regard it as an idle employment to attempt a true explanation of the numbers, given in the prophecies. But surely it was not an idle employment for the ancient Jews to endeavor to understand the meaning of the "70 weeks" of Daniel, beginning with the command to rebuild Jerusalem, and ending with the coming of the Messiah, Dan. 9, 25. By this prophecy the Jewish people were induced to expect the Messiah at about the time when he appeared.

Even God recommends or commands a diligent inquiry on this subject. "Here is wisdom. Let him, *that hath un-*

derstanding, count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred, threescore and six." Rev. 13: 18.

If it should be admitted, that the explanation of Irenæus, who found the number 666 in the Greek word, *Λατεινος* denoting the Latin or Roman Antichrist, is erroneous, and that the number has not been counted to the satisfaction of reason; yet it may be counted hereafter, so as to exclude all doubt. On the supposition, that a clear, unquestioned explanation should be given, and that the *precise* period of the rise of Antichrist,—generally believed to be at some point between the year 600 and 752,—should be found; then by the addition of 1260 years the precise time for the overthrow of Antichrist will be known. If there is a strong *probability*, that the origin of the persecuting power of the beast is to be dated somewhere from 600 to 752; then in the near approach of the millennium we should find cause of effort and grounds of hope. Even if no *certainty* on this subject should be obtained until the actual overthrow of Antichrist; yet, if then the mystery should be cleared up, and the light of certainty should strike every mind, all believers would thus be led to adore the infinite wisdom of God, who "declares the end from the beginning," and whose purposes are accomplished throughout all the earth.

In conclusion, the following schemes are proposed for the consideration of the reader:

First, we may date the rise of Antichrist in the year A. D. 606, when *Phocas*, then on the throne at Constantinople, constituted *Boniface* the third, (the bishop of Rome,) the *universal bishop* and supreme *head of the church.*

Or we may fix this date at A. D. 610, about which time *Boniface* IV. received from Phocas the Pantheon, at Rome, and converted it into a church; retaining, however, the pagan idolatry. "Here *Cybele* was succeeded by the *virgin Mary*, and the pagan deities, by Christian martyrs. Idolatry still subsisted, but the objects of it were changed." This, too, was about the period of the rise of Mohammedanism.

If we add to these dates the period of 1260 years, then the overthrow of Antichrist will be A. D. 1866, or 1870.

Next, we may date the rise of Antichrist in the year A.

D. 666. This is the precise number which the wisdom of God has communicated as the number of the beast, Rev. 13: 18. As Irenæus found this number in the Greek word *Λατεινος*, denoting the Latin or Roman Church, so it is remarkable, that in the year A. D. 666 Pope Vitalianus ordained that all public worship should be in Latin. It is also very remarkable, that down to the present day the Roman Catholic liturgy, or established public service, is, in all countries, in *Latin*, whether the people understand it or not. By adding 1260 to 666, the period for the overthrow of Antichrist will be A. D. 1926. If with some writers we suppose, that the 1290 and 1335 days of Daniel mean years, by adding to 1926 the 75 years (by which 1335 exceeds 1260) it brings us to A. D. 2001, the first year of the millennium. "Blessed" indeed is he, "who cometh" to that period.

One other scheme is this: that as the pope received from Pepin, king of France, the Exarchate of Ravenna about A. D. 752, and became then a temporal prince, that year is to be regarded as the rise of Antichrist. Of course he will be overthrown—this scheme being supposed to be true—in A. D. 2012.

I am not just now prepared to maintain the truth of any one of these schemes, although I doubt not, that one or the other of them is true; but this to my mind is very evident, that inasmuch as God has communicated the number of the persecuting beast, and calls upon the man of *understanding* to count that number, or to ascertain the very power described in prophecy and the commencement of the reign of Antichrist, the time will assuredly come, when the church will understand that number. The knowledge of this will be a key to unlock the mystery of the 1260 days of the Revelation. And then, doubtless, as the now obscure prophecy will stand forth in a blaze of light, the wisdom of God will be adored by the whole church.

In the meantime, in the absence of certainty, and while waiting for the light, which is yet to be shed upon the subject, every careful inquirer will be disposed to yield his opinion to the *greater probability*. If, then, in past events we cannot find any clear and exact fulfilment of the important prophecies concerning the equivalent periods of 3 1-2 times, 42 months, and 1260 days, the conclusion is, that in all probability the accomplishment or termination is yet future.

As those prophecies describe the rise and continued existence of a persecuting power, and the depressed state of the church generally, or of the church in some countries, during the period just mentioned ; and as the antichristian and persecuting power of Rome began to indicate its character about the year A. D. 606, being in this year made universal bishop,—and as the pope was crowned and made a temporal prince in the year A. D. 752,—and has ever since, down to the present day, held an unrighteous sway in opposition to the kingdom of Christ,—it seems altogether probable, that the overthrow of this persecuting power will occur at some period between A. D. 1840 and A. D. 2012. They, who think the years A. D. 606, and A. D. 666 are most worthy of consideration, will of course expect the overthrow of Antichrist in A. D. 1866 or in A. D. 1926, that is, in about 30 years or about 90 years from the present time. In either case the wondrous, long-expected day is *near*, when the delusions of miserable men shall pass away, and it shall be said to Zion,—"Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord hath arisen upon thee!" On either supposition an immense work is to be performed by the church,—a work of such appalling magnitude, as to discourage all labors but the labors of faith and heavenly zeal. To communicate the gospel to three quarters of the whole family of man ;—to gain access to the understandings and the consciences of four or five hundred millions of uninstructed and prejudiced men, idolaters, wedded to their idols ;—to break their strong habits of sin ;—to send the Bible to every family on the earth ;—and to train up half a million of preachers of the glad tidings of salvation ;—is not here work, more than enough for a century of strenuous effort on the part of the church? Is there not occasion also for trust in God's promise, for reliance on his almighty power, for all the fervency and importunity of supplication?

ARTICLE III.

THE ASPECT AND POSITION OF THE MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE, PARTICULARLY IN THE ORIENTAL WORLD.

By the Rev. George B. Cheever, pastor of the Allen-st. Presb. Church, New-York.

THE instability of human things is a proverb; the causes of it, though equally clear, are not so proverbial. Yet the most superficial observer must be aware of a great principle in God's dealings with this world, the principle of revolution and change, till the world becomes holy. In the nature of things this principle must prevail, for there can be no more peace or permanence to a wicked world than to a wicked man. If we are not greatly mistaken, it is declared, as a rule, that God's providence in the world is to go on overturning, and overturning, and overturning, till it shall bring all into subjection to Jesus Christ. A truly philosophic mind, philosophic in the Christian sense, would always keep this fact in view in the world's history; for it is the business of a true philosopher to discover, as far as possible, the purposes of God, and the end to which human things are tending.

To a spiritual mind the science of history, pursued, as for the most part it has been, without reference to the providence and designs of God, is as devoid of truth as the science of astronomy with the earth, instead of the sun, considered as the centre of our system. Our historical studies are on the Ptolemaic instead of the Copernican scheme, and man, instead of God, is put at the centre. We need the application of some devout and comprehensive mind, to erect history into a science, and tie it to the throne and providence of God. We need a Newton almost as much to tell us why an apple falls in God's providential government, as we did a century ago to tell us the reason of that simplest fact in God's material universe.

There is, at the present day, a wide and strong impression among Protestant Christians of almost every name,

that we are on the eve of a great universal dispensation of mercy to the world. This impression may have been weakened in some minds by particular views respecting the second and personal coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the destruction of the nations instead of their conversion, as near at hand. Still, it is widely and fondly entertained. In the consideration of the grounds of that impression, and the prospect of its realization, three main points come into view, viz., its foundation in the course of God's prophecies ; the lessons to be learned in regard to it from God's past providences ; and the present great apparent crisis in God's providential dispensations, in reference to the Missionary Enterprise, especially in the Oriental World.

To dwell in detail upon the prophecies would require a volume. Premising, therefore, that the whole world's conversion is predicted in the Scriptures, for which assertion, if there were no other authority, Malachi 1 : 11 would afford sufficient ground, we doubtless have in one particular passage in the New Testament an important landmark and mooring place for our views on this subject. The Apostle Paul, in the eleventh to the Romans, affirms that the Gentile nations are to be converted to God, and that when this is done, or at least far advanced in its progress, the conversion of the Jews will follow.

That the Gentile nations never have been converted is as plain as that the Jews never have been converted ; therefore, both these great events are still future. Whatever views some men may entertain in regard to the personal coming of Christ, it is manifest that no theories are to be indulged, which contravene the sense of this express prediction. The "coming in" of the fulness of the Gentiles, and the general conversion of the Jews, are subjects of clear and undoubted prophecy. To suppose that the personal coming of Christ is to take place before these events, makes their prediction a falsity. It seems, indeed, in the highest degree absurd to suppose that the second coming of Christ is near at hand, when there are hundreds of millions that as yet have never even heard of his first coming. There is a great dispensation of mercy before us for the world ; the course of prophecy, the course of God's providence, and the signs of the times, all show it.

In attempting to trace the lessons to be learned in regard

ARTICLE III.

THE ASPECT AND POSITION OF THE MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE, PARTICULARLY IN THE ORIENTAL WORLD.

By the Rev. George B. Cheever, pastor of the Allen-st. Presb. Church, New-York.

THE instability of human things is a proverb; the causes of it, though equally clear, are not so proverbial. Yet the most superficial observer must be aware of a great principle in God's dealings with this world, the principle of revolution and change, till the world becomes holy. In the nature of things this principle must prevail, for there can be no more peace or permanence to a wicked world than to a wicked man. If we are not greatly mistaken, it is declared, as a rule, that God's providence in the world is to go on overturning, and overturning, and overturning, till it shall bring all into subjection to Jesus Christ. A truly philosophic mind, philosophic in the Christian sense, would always keep this fact in view in the world's history; for it is the business of a true philosopher to discover, as far as possible, the purposes of God, and the end to which human things are tending.

To a spiritual mind the science of history, pursued, as for the most part it has been, without reference to the providence and designs of God, is as devoid of truth as the science of astronomy with the earth, instead of the sun, considered as the centre of our system. Our historical studies are on the Ptolemaic instead of the Copernican scheme, and man, instead of God, is put at the centre. We need the application of some devout and comprehensive mind, to erect history into a science, and tie it to the throne and providence of God. We need a Newton almost as much to tell us why an apple falls in God's providential government, as we did a century ago to tell us the reason of that simplest fact in God's material universe.

There is, at the present day, a wide and strong impression among Protestant Christians of almost every name,

that we are on the eve of a great universal dispensation of mercy to the world. This impression may have been weakened in some minds by particular views respecting the second and personal coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the destruction of the nations instead of their conversion, as near at hand. Still, it is widely and fondly entertained. In the consideration of the grounds of that impression, and the prospect of its realization, three main points come into view, viz., its foundation in the course of God's prophecies ; the lessons to be learned in regard to it from God's past providences ; and the present great apparent crisis in God's providential dispensations, in reference to the Missionary Enterprise, especially in the Oriental World.

To dwell in detail upon the prophecies would require a volume. Premising, therefore, that the whole world's conversion is predicted in the Scriptures, for which assertion, if there were no other authority, Malachi 1 : 11 would afford sufficient ground, we doubtless have in one particular passage in the New Testament an important landmark and mooring place for our views on this subject. The Apostle Paul, in the eleventh to the Romans, affirms that the Gentile nations are to be converted to God, and that when this is done, or at least far advanced in its progress, the conversion of the Jews will follow.

That the Gentile nations never have been converted is as plain as that the Jews never have been converted ; therefore, both these great events are still future. Whatever views some men may entertain in regard to the personal coming of Christ, it is manifest that no theories are to be indulged, which contravene the sense of this express prediction. The "coming in" of the fulness of the Gentiles, and the general conversion of the Jews, are subjects of clear and undoubted prophecy. To suppose that the personal coming of Christ is to take place before these events, makes their prediction a falsity. It seems, indeed, in the highest degree absurd to suppose that the second coming of Christ is near at hand, when there are hundreds of millions that as yet have never even heard of his first coming. There is a great dispensation of mercy before us for the world ; the course of prophecy, the course of God's providence, and the signs of the times, all show it.

In attempting to trace the lessons to be learned in regard

to this matter from the course of past providences, some great principles in God's providential government come into notice. And first, its universal extent.

The possibility of such a thing as chance is excluded even from philosophy. John Newton used to say that he never heard a knock at the door without connecting it with the Divine Providence; and we have often thought, in reading or remembering the story of Bruce in the History of Scotland, that there is a providence even in the weaving of a spider's web. Nor is the providence of God positive, merely where there are no intervening intelligent agents visible between God and the result; as in the so called accidental falling of a tower, or the providential breaking of a thunderstorm. The results which human beings bring about as free agents, in all the most uncontrolled freedom of their conduct, are under that overruling Providence, just as much as the consequences of a fire in Constantinople, an eruption of Vesuvius, or an avalanche in Switzerland. The man who freights a ship, and he who, for the sake of the insurance, scuttles her; the man who fires a church at the instigation of the devil, and he who builds one for the love of Christ; the man who raises a province in rebellion, and he who fights to put it down; are all moving equally as parts of God's providential plan, as much so as the accidents that destroy both the righteous and the wicked, the storms that waste and those that fertilize a country. God does not leave the world, either of nature or of human beings, under mere law; he is himself the omnipotent Agent; and as

> Nature is but the name for an effect
> Whose cause is God,

so the world's history, even in the maddest and wildest developments of human passion, is but the name for a tissue of events, throughout the whole of which God's overruling providence has been present. Into the weaving of this vast web ten thousand elements of wickedness have entered; all imaginable contrasted and conflicting colours of depravity; God's enemies raging, and the elemental war of chaos morally at work; but God's hand has always been behind the loom, arranging every thread, and guiding the whole figure, with such consummate wisdom, that by and by, when the tapestry is all finished, and hung up in eternity, will fill the

universe with admiration. At present we can only see it by piecemeals; we have got no gallery large enough to display it in; and of that part where the weaving runs parallel with our own little line of life, we can only have the dim forecasting in imagination of what the glorious outline will be. Except for the known genius of the Artist, we cannot prophecy the result. We have, however, in divine prediction a sketch of the intended picture which we see progressing, and by careful study may make something out. And though the prophetic sketch in revelation reaches up to heaven, amidst the realities of eternity, while its gradual completion is yet upon earth, amidst many and diverse materials, yet, by careful comparison, and a constant application of the light of revelation to earthly things, we may make something out; we may at least see God's providence as through a glass darkly; in all things that concern ourselves, if we will use our helps well, we may know the time of our own visitation, although it be not for us to know the times and seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power.

A second point is in the caution, that God's providence, any more than his word, is not to be reduced to a perfect artificial human system; its own greatness and our ignorance alike forbid. In this we may apply what Lord Bacon (Advancement of Learning) happily says of *systems* of Divinity. "For he that will reduce a knowledge into an art, will make it round and uniform: but in divinity many things must be left abrupt, and concluded with this; *O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!* So again the apostle saith, *we know in part;* and to have the form of a total, where there is matter but for a part, cannot be, without supplies by supposition and presumption." Supposition and presumption are as easy systems of knowledge in the ways of God's providence, as conjectural emendation in the study of God's word. But we are warned against it. For while it is said, *Thy judgments are as the light that goeth forth*, it is also said, *Thy judgments are as a great deep:* and our blessed Lord did once take occasion to reprove those who would make an unauthorized and ill-natured interpretation of God's judgments. "*Suppose ye that those sinners, on whom the tower in Siloam fell, were*

sinners above all them that dwelt in Jerusalem? I tell you nay; but except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish."

Interpreting the Divine providence in reference to human destiny, we are under restrictions; in reference to the Divine glory, we are under none. To this last grand result all things tend harmoniously; all dispensations sweeping onward; even the wrath of man shall praise God; the curses of his enemies shall glorify him. The rainbow of his divine attributes encircles the darkest storms of wickedness, and binds them for the reflection of his glory to the gaze of an admiring universe.

A third point, without any question, is this, that all human revolutions are connected with the cross of Christ. Sometimes we see that connection plainly, sometimes not. Sometimes, when the main current of a great series of events flows darkly, there are certain inferior included connections with God's purposes, which we seem to see very plainly. We are accustomed to look at things minutely, more than in the mass. The meanings of God are watched very indifferently any where; our vision is circumscribed, and its habit microscopic rather than telescopic. A comprehensive view is needed. If a mind like that which produced the History of Human Redemption should take Gibbon's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, and point out, as it went onward through that mighty tide of events, the moral and spiritual connexions of its course with the great designs of God;—or if an angel should do this,—what a divinely illuminated margin would surround every page!

Sometimes a design, unacknowledged in the event, becomes clear in the history. The providence of God, invisible for many years, shines out at length so brightly, as to compel the admiration of every beholder. It is said there are stars so distant, that though their light has been travelling towards us ever since creation, it has not yet reached us; so there are meanings in God's dispensations, a light in events long past, which, through our imperfection of moral vision, or the thick medium through which we have to judge, may not yet have broken upon us, may not, indeed, till far in the bosom of eternity. The meaning of the brazen serpent in the wilderness was not seen till the Son of Man was lifted up upon the cross. The purpose of David's education as a shepherd was not read till the publication of the book of

Psalms. There was a meaning in that three years' drought and famine in the time of Elijah in the reign of Ahab in the land of Judea, not known even to the church of God, till the general epistle of James, after the crucifixion of our Saviour. An event like that of Bunyan's imprisonment for thirteen years had a meaning that could not be seen by that generation, indeed is but beginning to be known now, after the translation of the Pilgrim's Progress into more than twenty languages. An event in a still greater cycle of dispensations, like the banishment of the Puritans to America, had a meaning which we are now only beginning to comprehend. An event like that which threw the key of the Mediterranean into possession of a Protestant power, and did the same with that bridge between the oriental and occidental world, the Island of Malta, could not be understood, till those future events had begun to open, in preparation for which those previous steps of God's providence were taken. The establishment of the English East India Company, and the vast accession of power to the English nation over the continent of India, are events to be read in connection with that beneficent missionary effort now following, and which, sooner or later, must follow in the train of the advancement of a Protestant Christian nation's political empire.

The path of God's providence in reference to his own people is far more clear and intelligible than its meaning in regard to others; and the reason is very plain; for they are under his especial guidance, and are the channel of his benevolence to the world; and all events in reference to themselves are to be interpreted by that rule of mercy, all things work together for good to them that love God; and in reference to others, and to the world at large in connection with themselves, by another probable rule, that in proportion to their fervent breathings after usefulness, all things shall work together for God's greatest glory through their instrumentality. The life of God's people in its windings through a dark generation and the wilderness of the world is like a silver streamlet shining to the sun; it is like a line of fountains and of palm trees through the desert. Wherever any portion of God's church lives, there is God's light shining, there are the Divine purposes concentrating: and if the temper of the people of God were more simple, childlike, and devout, the course of the Divine providence in them,

amidst the world of the ungodly, would be like a furrow of light ploughed into chaos. If it were not for the course of Redemption, and the existence of the church of Christ through the world's history, there could be no more interest in the movements of a fallen world than in a contest of gladiators. If any man could be pleased with the one spectacle, he might with the other; but the events on earth lose all meaning, as soon as they are dissevered from their connection with the progressive kingdom of Jesus. Nor can they ever be read in their true meaning till that connection is in some way made visible to the mind.

A fourth point of importance is the spirituality of view necessary for the comprehension of the meaning either of providence or prophecy. We should see God's providential glory in the world much more clearly were we more spiritual. A man accustomed to walk with God, and to see all things under the influences of his Spirit, possesses a power of observation, to which others are perfect strangers. A sort of spiritual intuition is attained in the movements and designs of God. As a seaman can detect a ship in the horizon where a landsman sees only the clear sky; can interpret the first moanings of a storm, when a landsman sees only fair weather; so it is in spiritual things. A great deal depends on one's position in the spiritual world. To those that inhabit the mountain tops, the light breaks a great while earlier, and shines a great while longer, than to those that live in the valley. And so, if a man will but take pains to get above the world, he shall live a great part of his time in the clear light of God, and in the enjoyment of a vast prospect. One can never forget the spiritual lessons which he learns amidst the mountain scenery of Switzerland. Often, when the vales were filled with clouds, we were told by those who knew the weather that it was bright above, and a favorable day for our excursion: and sometimes, after toiling upwards for hours amidst a wet mist so thick that scarce the path before us was visible, we rose suddenly into the clear atmosphere, with an illimitable vast of creation disclosed as in a moment, with the tops of the snow-shining mountains around us, and that immense abyss of cloud beneath, as we ascended higher, a white extended sea in billows of smooth dove-like beauty to the morning sun. The summits of those gigantic mountains, bright like the day, and as

calm as eternity, might offer no unworthy symbols of the everlasting plans of God, amidst all the rebellion and confusion of his enemies. To the eye of God, and to the vision of angels, the commingling passions and events of earth may offer as bright a reflection of the Divine glory, as that glorious sea of cloud to those above it, while those below were toiling in darkness and dripping with mist.

The path of God's providence in the accomplishment of his allwise designs is not a way like a rail-road, driven straight through the world, in geometrical accuracy, without variety or grandeur. In meeting the mountains of human depravity, God does not level them, nor run through the heart of them, but builds upon them, like the road of the Simplon over the Alps, and encircles them in such a way, that at every step and turn the eye commands new scenes of glory. The path of the Divine providence deals so with human wickedness, in the expedients of infinite wisdom, instead of the exercise of mere physical omnipotence, that sometimes you seem to be going backwards, when you are, on the whole, advancing, and sometimes you seem to be descending, when you are, on the whole, rising; just as, in ascending a mountain, you have to take many a laborious zigzag to get up higher. God takes men as they are, and governs them as free moral agents, and sometimes leaves their passions to a full sweep, raging within the great circles of his purposes, but like a wheel within a wheel, always advancing. Which is the greater display of God's glory, the mere exertion of almighty power, like that which said, "Let there be light, and there was light," destroying all evil agents, and annihilating evil and opposition at once; or the perpetual exercise of infinite wisdom and mercy in a world of probation, making all the successive designs of his enemies only so many steps in the accomplishment of his own, ensnaring the wicked in the work of their own hands, causing the wrath of man to praise him, drawing the lines of his providence over mighty obstacles as over great heights of glory, establishing the Redeemer's kingdom upon Satan's kingdom even as a part of its foundation, and not only turning evil into good, but out of evil still educing good, in infinite progression?

We are yet at the foundation of the scheme of human redemption, in the midst of the preparatory work for the

world's conversion. What can be more interesting to spiritual spectators in the heavenly world, than to see the great troops of God's enemies, in the utmost rage, malignity, and fiery violence of their industry, just cutting out and bringing in great blocks of marble to rear up the highway of the Divine providence! Of all the distorted shapes of evil which they can contrive to throw in the way, probably there is not one, out of which some good use is not witnessed in heaven. God is an omnipotent moral architect, and makes enemies as well as friends do his bidding; in their short-sighted wickedness, the rebels against his government are only proved his materials to work with.

The same may be said of empires as of individuals. The great Christian Poet of England has occupied some of his sublimest pages in the delineation of these lessons:

> Know thou that heavenly wisdom on this ball
> Creates, gives birth to, guides, consummates, all;
> That, which laborious and quick-thoughted man
> Snuff'd up the praise of, what he seems to plan,
> He first conceives, then perfects his design,
> As a mere instrument in hands divine.
> Blind to the workings of that secret power,
> That balances the wings of every hour,
> The busy trifler dreams himself alone,
> Frames many a purpose, and God works his own.
> States thrive and wither, as moons wax and wane,
> Even as his will and his decree ordain.
> While honor, virtue, piety, bear sway,
> They flourish, and as these decline, decay.
> In just resentment of his injured laws,
> He pours contempt on them and on their cause;
> Strikes the rough thread of error right athwart
> The web of every scheme they have at heart:
> Bids rottenness invade and bring to dust
> The pillars of support, in which they trust;
> And do his errand of disgrace and shame
> On the chief strength and glory of the frame.

It seems to be another great principle in God's providence to use this world "as the great laboratory of truth for the universe; and that no truth can be fully brought out, nor its virtue proved, till it has undergone every experiment to which perverted ingenuity can subject it, and every modification which the mistakes of its friends can give it." This remark, thrown out by Mr. Dana, is of importance in considering the time necessary for the display of the Divine providence. Truth here is in a state of warfare; truth and goodness against error and wickedness. The world's pro-

blem may thus be stated. Given: the rebellion and depravity of man. Required: to make the most out of this state of things, for the confirmation of Divine truth, and the revelation of the Divine glory. To bring out the result of this problem in full requires necessarily that human wickedness should have time and room to play in, and Divine truth time and room to be tested in. In this view of things, there are ample reasons, even to our short vision, why God should not arbitrarily interpose to cut short the instructive drama, either by a miracle of sudden universal regeneration, or in any other way. He will let the play be played out, for in no other circumstances than just such a world of probation as this affords could such a series of scenes for the instruction of the universe be unfolded; and meantime, the very presence of God's truth, in its trial, is enough to vindicate his righteousness, were there any imputation thrown out against it on account of the slow progress of redemption in the world. Men have their own consciences, and the invisible things of God in the creation; they may hear, obey, and finish the conflict between truth and error, if they choose. They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them; they have Christ and his apostles, and may bring the scene to a close whenever they are willing. Meantime, while they are delaying, and the longsuffering of God also waits, grand principles are unfolding. Here the trouble of Job, Why doth the wicked live? and of David, How long shall the wicked triumph? receive for the present a satisfactory answer.

Human revolutions grow out of human passion. Human revolutions may be termed the mediums, the bases, to use the chemical phrase, through which the tissue of truth has to be passed, that its colors may be permanently set; thus fixed in historical experience, the figures never wash out, but the lessons of wisdom remain for ever. The same may be said of human depravity in connection with God's word; every variety and strength of it, through which the illuminated record of the wisdom of God's Spirit is passed, does but set its divine colors more deeply, and give them an intense light. The process looks strange, and often very hazardous, while the truth is passing through it; but in the end, it is all the more glorious. Divine truth shone all the brighter at the era of the Reformation, for those preceding ages of Papistical superstition, persecution, and darkness. Divine truth

will only shine the brighter and more permanent, for that medium of infidelity through which it has been passing in Germany. It takes time for such experiments; but *one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day;* and in working out truth for eternity the experience of thousands of years is but a little. We should regard an empire as comparatively stable, that should stand the circle of ten centuries; but what is that, when it has perished? What is that in comparison with the permanence of truth and righteousness?

Great practical truths we always learn very slowly, and nations more slowly than individuals. The nations take their course, and by and by a mighty truth is illustrated in their experience. The appalling consequences of the extremes of national infidelity and atheism in the dissolution of society into the mere chaotic elements of wickedness, was exhibited in the whirlwind of the French Revolution. The more important truth that the preservation of empires in happiness depends upon the vital principles of the gospel is slower and more gradual in working out. The baneful influences of the Roman Catholic religion on nations long under its power is a lesson quite apart from the discovery and conviction of its monstrous errors and superstitions. These were laid bare at the era of the Reformation; but at that time the progress of those causes of national ruin was as yet hidden; they were not regarded as such; their deleterious influence in sapping the vital energy of a people, and poisoning their whole character, their alliance with despotism, their opposition to the freedom of the human mind, and their connection with almost all possible evils, which humanity in great masses can suffer, demanded a different exposure. The free and noble growth of Protestant States, with all the grand and state-supporting institutions growing out of Protestantism, must be exhibited side by side with the decrepitude and degradation of empires under the incubus of Popery. The pure and happy domestic character of a Prosestant people must be compared with the discomfort and licentiousness of social life elsewhere.

In the providence of God great evils are sometimes left to work their own cure. They become so enormous, as to attract the gaze and abhorrence of all, and the acknowledgment and conviction even of those who cling to them. It

is in this way that a conviction of the evil of slavery, not only as a sin, but as a cause of national and state degradation and political ruin, is sometimes forced upon the mind. The ruin of nations by evils, which the selfishness and love of error in the mind of man would not admit as evils, though declared as such even in the word of God, and marked with the seal of his reprobation, is a mode of teaching on a vast scale, for which this world, as the laboratory of truth for the universe, affords a grand opportunity. Who can tell that our own beloved country, in spite of all the apparent purposes of God for our good, is not destined to show such a lesson to the universe on a most appalling scale! We need beware, or God will leave the evil we are cherishing, to work its own cure in our destruction.

The lessons to be drawn from this slight survey of the methods of God's providence, converge directly and powerfully upon the missionary enterprise of the present day. Divine wisdom has been laying long and mighty trains of events, of which the connection from generation to generation is sometimes to us invisible, but which are always ripening to a great fulfilment. Meantime, disciplinary arrangements, and secondary providential movements, necessary for the stability of the object aimed at, have been also accomplishing. Perversions of the gospel have been fully tried; the experiment of a vast scheme of false Christianity has failed; the mystery of iniquity has wrought to the uttermost; the experience of a church embraced, perverted, and weakened by the world, has gathered into history a host of heresies with all their consequences of corruption for the future warning and guidance of a church that is to embrace and save the world. The laboratory of truth has been wide open, and depraved and ingenious minds have rushed in to scrutinize and distort it with unsparing and unavailing malignity. The nations have tried the path of Atheism, and empire after empire, crash after crash, strews the ground.

With these general lessons before us, we may proceed to notice the present apparent crisis of God's providential movements in reference to the Missionary Enterprise.

The history of the church on earth is a history of experiments in human nature. They have been made by Divine providence in vast cycles of time, on a scale of great grandeur. The first embraced the whole Antediluvian world

for 2000 years ; the second, with a chosen people, and a great dispensation, lasted for 2000 years longer : the third, with the Gentile world, for nearly 2000 more ; the fourth is now in operation. The first experiment ended in the deluge ; the second closed with the crucifixion ; the third was renounced at the reformation ; the last has but just been entered on. It was a Hebrew Church after the deluge ; a Christian Church after the destruction of Jerusalem ; and last of all, a Reformed Christian Church out of the corrupt Roman Catholic. It remains to be seen whether this last experiment will have the permanence of either of the others ; whether it will have the comprehensive spirit of that which preceded it, and at the same time, unlike that, retain, as it progresses, the purity and simplicity of the truth as it is in Jesus. It is this last experiment, in which it would seem that God destines the Missionary Enterprise to be at least recommenced on a scale proportionate to its grandeur. The work of preparation for that enterprise has been going on for centuries, with steadfast and increasing energy. Its commencement dates with the Reformation. The whole foundation of the modern work of missions may be traced to the little town of Eisenach, in Germany, the birth-place of Luther.

Here, in attempting to gather up the meanings of events as they roll onward to the completion of the Divine purposes, we cannot but remark on the wonderful providence of God in first breaking through, and breaking into pieces that form of spiritual despotism with which the Romish Hierarchy had encircled the Christian world. The Roman Catholic religion had grown into such a den of abominations, such an engine of ambition, cruelty, and lust, such a collection and defence of enormous abuses, that it had ceased to be the Church of Christ, and had become at once the mother of harlots and the man of sin. The form of unity, and of catholic, that is universal worship, does not constitute the Christian Church, any more than the form of crystals constitutes salt. The constitution of a new Church at such a period is not a separation from the Church of Christ, nor a division in it, but a solemn disowning of that false system of iniquity, which, in the face of Heaven, has usurped that sacred name. It was the assertion of freedom and religion for the followers of Christ, wherever they might choose to

worship him. Nor is it desirable that ever again the Church of Christ on earth should possess such enormous external unity, such overshadowing predominance as an undivided institution with an earthly head. It cannot be regarded as useful, as favorable to liberty or humility, or as consonant with the genius of the Scriptures. The division of the Church of Christ into coexisting sections is a movement in the providence of God, preparatory to the universal spread of the gospel, which probably never will be altered.

The devotion of the Jesuits to the Romish Church, their identification of themselves with the interests of that Church, was an ambitious spirit of aggrandizement, like to any thing rather than that devotion which Christ requires from his followers. The afflictions which Paul professes himself ready to suffer for Christ's body's sake, which is the Church, were to be endured, not for the *power* of the Church, but for its *edification;* the glory which is to be given to Christ in the Church is not the glory of an external unity, but of inward, all-conquering love. The unity of the Church is not unity under a particular earthly head, but the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, and the unity of faith in the knowledge of the Son of God. A Church may have an unbroken form, an unbroken faith, and an unbroken succession of pastors from the time of the apostles, and yet not be the Church of Christ, nor any part of it. The arrogant pretension of the Church of England to be exclusively the Church of Christ, and its submission in established unity to an earthly head, is utterly contrary to the spirit of the gospel. The dedication of the Apocalypse was not to *the* Church *of* Asia Minor, but to the seven Churches of Christ *in* Asia Minor. Had that book been sent to the kingdom of Great Britain, its style of designation must have been, not, John to the Churches of Christ *in* England, but, John to the Established Church *of* England professing to be in Christ.

The grand cause of corruption and persecution in the Romish Church was its unity under an earthly head. And the garment of Christ's body had better be torn into ten thousand pieces, than preserved seamless from top to bottom, only to be a seamless covering and defence of concentrated despotism and impurity.

The work of missions, therefore, could not have been committed to the Roman Catholic Church, nor to any part

of the Church before the 15th century; it must of necessity have been reserved for a Church that holds the truth in freedom and purity. It needed likewise a Church *imbued* with the truth, not merely electrified with the new perception of it. Accordingly, a nation had been training up and disciplining for God's purposes, and Protestant England, in which a greater spirit of liberty and knowledge prevailed than any where else, was selected as his sanctuary. There the ark of God rested, till the earth began to put on its verdure. The principles newly revealed at the Reformation were clothed with power of language, and dwelt richly in the English mind. The whole compass of Divine truth was investigated by English theologians; men of the profoundest learning and the profoundest piety at once combined their powers upon it. The deepest erudition and the most heavenly wisdom were brought to the illustration of the Scriptures. A body of speculative and practical theology grew up in the 17th century, such as could not be surpassed, and in its depth and richness afforded a bank sufficient for the whole world to draw upon. For the accumulation and circulation of all this wisdom, and for the carrying out of the great purposes connected with the Reformation, the providence of God had revealed to the world the art of printing, on the very eve of that mighty event.

Meanwhile, the New World had been discovered, and the North American Continent peopled with Protestant believers. Here we may admire the wisdom of God in deferring the discovery of the New World, till a people suited to his purposes had been made ready to inhabit it. If Columbus had made his heaven-directed voyage only two or three centuries earlier, the whole western world, from its northern to its southern extremity, would have been peopled with Roman Catholics, bound in bigotry and superstition to the court of Rome; and the beast, though driven from his throne in Europe, would have found still a secure refuge and a throne unshaken across the Atlantic. The birth of Columbus was deferred till just before the birth of Luther; the Old World's Reformer trod fast upon the footsteps of the New World's Discoverer; so that, while the one was making his prodigious discoveries, the other was laying a train of causes to possess and preserve them for the Divine glory. Then again the occupation of America by Protestants was de-

ferred till a race had sprung up, made out of the best stuff in England,—a race who would go to forward the Divine purposes, and not, like the Spaniards, to kill the natives, and labor for the lust of gold. Nurtured in Protestant theology, alike learned and godly, animated by an indomitable spirit of liberty, and prepared for their work in Protestant fires of persecution, the Puritans were the instruments whom God had appointed to raise up a people prepared for his name. Accordingly, in the fulness of time, the persecution of their own enemies, in God's overruling providence, banished them to this country, to fulfil one of the most glorious destinies in the history of man.

While the Church grew on and knit to strength in New-England, a people like the Puritans, with the same fire of liberty and religion, were gathering, in Old England, a dissenting Church, purified in persecution, and filled with the Spirit of God. In this hemisphere and in that, the whole discipline of the Church has been in some respects eminently favorable for the part she is to bear in the accomplishment of God's purposes. Two grand fundamental lessons have been teaching ever since the Reformation, burnt in with fire, into the heart and experience of God's people, and still working out in greater visible truth, and becoming every day more universally acknowledged and established; toleration, and independence of an earthly head. Without a Church that had learned these lessons, it is hard to see how the world could ever have been conquered in the name of Christ. It might have been by the arm of power, in fierce despotism, in an enforced unity of blood and fire; but never by truth and love. These lessons God is therefore impressing upon his people, as the result both of experiment and argument, and is all the while drawing the array of his providences closer and thicker in every generation.

In Europe and Asia the fallow ground of the nations was broken up by the French Revolution, a scene of madness and crime, which, with the vast and rapid movements of Napoleon, marched in the van of God's mighty preparations. Since that series of events, knowledge has been increasing, many have run to and fro, inventions and discoveries in science and the arts have been multiplying with extraordinary speed. A great source of power, and a striking indication of Providence, is the almost universal

prevalence of the English language. The students in the Missionary Seminary at Basle, call the English language the missionary language; and well they may. The present population of the British empire, including its kingdoms, colonies, and dependencies, is 150,000,000, comprising 4,457,000 square miles. The area of the Roman empire, at the summit of its glory, is estimated by Gibbon at only 1,600,000 square miles. What a comparison might this fact suggest, between the field of missionary enterprise now, and that of the world in the time of the apostles! Among the whole of this vast population the English language is sprinkled at intervals; it prevails to a great extent in the British possessions in India and on the continent of New Holland; the two mightiest Protestant nations of the earth speak it as their native tongue, the two nations more prominent than all others for their missionary exertions, which, indeed, is the grand fact pointed at in that designation of the missionary language; in South Africa, and on the western coasts of that dark quarter there are settlements that speak it; it is found, almost without exception, wherever there is a missionary station in the world. It is like a great wall of intelligence running round the whole circuit of the missionary field, with strong towers rising up at intervals, so that in truth the watchmen see eye to eye; they shall lift up their voice, with the voice together shall they sing, when the Lord shall bring again Zion. Whatever the multitude of different dialects to be encountered, this one missionary language in a manner encircles them all.

As God, in his providence, has thrown over the earth this bond of intelligent union, and has increased the acquisition of every sort of knowledge and power, which could fit the Church of Jesus to work under their Divine Head, so he has provided facilities to carry the army of laborers and the array of materials all over the world. In the invention of rail-roads and steam-engines, he has gone far to annihilate distance, and, what is more, to remove the mountains interposed, and the prejudices, that make enemies of nations. The first steamer that turned its noisy paddles in the silent harbors of the Mediterranean sea, was the prophet of a glorious revelation. That sea is his, and he made it; and he it is, whose providence, unveiling the secret powers of nature, has covered its romantic waters with those sailless

ships, that in their swift course bring almost within a stone's throw the civilized and barbarous countries that line its lovely circuit. It was the privilege of the writer to visit these countries soon after the establishment of regular steam communication between them. It was interesting to notice the effect of that event upon the minds of devoted missionaries, who had long toiled in those regious. We stood one evening with such a servant of Christ on the quay in Smyrna, gazing with deep interest across its noble bay, at the coming steamer, as she advanced, regardless of wind and tide, to her place of anchorage in the harbor. Never shall I forget, said Mr. Temple, speaking of his feelings when that star of the providence of God rose on the missionary horizon,—never shall I forget the excitement of my mind, when the first steam vessel entered our harbor in Smyrna. Our chain of bondage was broken, and I seemed to see, as in a vision of the Lord, the glorious future events that wait upon that movement. It was, indeed, a jubilee to many hearts.

Throughout the whole extent of what was once Rome's Empire, the facilities of communication will soon be easier, in every direction, than they ever were in the proudest state of Rome's dominions. The missionaries and their stations are no longer alone; the thrill of feeling and the flash of intelligence goes almost with electric rapidity from one to the other, and from the whole across the ocean. Curiosity is awakening in all lands; the apathy even of the Turkish character is giving way before the marvels of European civilization; the power of the Koran is diminishing, and a breach is made in the influence of the false prophet by every step taken by the Sultan and the Shah to assimilate their people to the manners of the occidental world. The obstacles that prevent the access of Divine truth to their hearts, and its power over their consciences, are gradually removing; a spirit of inquiry and of life is breathed into oriental sects of Christianity, and living instruments for God's Spirit to work with, native leaders of the sacramental host of God's elect, are here and there rising up. The field is every day getting more ready for the chariots of salvation to move upon, and the great Head of the Church is selecting his ground, posting his armies, and occupying fortresses for the last great conflict with the powers of darkness. In all political movements in the East, whether

of peace or war, of open strife and agitation, or of secret intrigue, in armed bands, or in the wiles of diplomacy, God's purposes are working. It is not possible to travel in the East, and not feel the stir of the great preparation.

"The hum of either army stilly sounds!"

The wings of angels on their errands almost brush past you in the air, and you hear their voices. The same work of preparation is on its way in China, and there too the providence of God, in keeping that vast empire closed against the influx of the Roman Catholics, till Protestants should be ready to enter with the gospel, is worthy of admiring gratitude. We look with deep interest towards opening events in that region. It seems as if God were about to break down the wall of the Celestial Empire, and give free access to the gospel in every part of it.

The concentration of interest upon Constantinople, Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt, is remarkable. There are great signs in the division and decline of the Mohammedan power, the advance of the principles of toleration. and the complication of Oriental with European politics, just at the time when so many interior changes in manners and in feeling, preparatory to the reception of the gospel, are going on. In connection with these things, the position of the Jews, and the increasing expectation, attention and efforts of the Church in regard to them, are significant. We think we may see indications of the meeting of those two tides of glory spoken of by Paul, which are together to roll over the world. The lines of prophecy in reference to Jew and Gentile run parallel; we should not expect to see the fulfilment of the one, unless the attention of the world were turned upon the other; in proportion as the preparations of Divine providence for the one are accomplishing, the arrangements for the other will be completed in their train. If the coming in of the fulness of the Gentiles is to be the period for the conversion of the Jews, the calling again of the Jews, is also to be as life from the dead to the unconverted Gentiles. Here is a definite point. When it begins to appear, we may know that these things are nigh, even at the doors. Looking now across these vast and troubled waters, we think we see that circular central commotion,

which indicates the actual meeting of those two main currents.

The struggle in the oriental world must be one of intense interest, were it only for the remarkable fact, that the Mohammedan Empire *comprehends nearly the whole scene of the transactions recorded in the Scriptures.* The spots connected with the most sacred associations in the world's history, the points that are the mind's landmarks of interest and glory through the waste of ages, from the garden of Eden to the garden of Gethsemane, are there. We can touch but lightly, in detail, upon any part of this vast field, but we may dwell for one moment on that strange land, where our own feet have been privileged to wander amidst the ruins of three thousand years; that marvellous land of pyramids whose tops pierce heaven; that land of early enchantments and divine miracles, the cradle of post-diluvian antiquity and knowledge, the womb of half the world's science, and almost its grave! The broad seal of divine truth is stamped on every evidence of its present wretchedness, and every vestige of its long past glory. The temples that remain, and those that have fallen; the structures that still command the mind's irrepressible admiration and amazement, and the mouldering sphinxes that the feet tread upon; the tombs untenanted of their antique dead, and those vast colossal statues, that, like mighty spirits of the past, stand as time's sentinels over buried cities;—all proclaim the unchangeable veracity of the word of God. They tell what Egypt has been, in the period of its grandeur, as the greatest of earth's empires; and that exactly what God's truth predicted, God's power has accomplished, in its prostration as "*the basest of kingdoms.*"

But they have another voice; it is one of promised mercy, even amidst wrath and desolation. Egypt enjoys a distinction among the nations, as great in her predicted regeneration, as in her present overthrow and ruin. Side by side in the word of God stand the assurance of his wrath and the assurance of his mercy. The wrath has fallen, the mercy is to come; the proof of the one confirms the hope and expectation of the other. You may stand amidst the ruins of Egypt's idolatry upon promises of her Christian greatness. You may take the definite predictions of God's grace yet unaccomplished, and plead them, if you will, at

the very foot of her mutilated idols, that seem, as with the voice of three thousand years, wailing the predictions of God's wrath verified. We look back upon it as a moment of intense interest, when, alone, in the innermost and oldest sanctuary of that vast temple of Karnak, that belts half the plain of Thebes, we kneeled down upon a shattered granite column, to break the stillness with the voice of prayer—to plead that the promise might come to its fulfilment, even as the threatening; that there, where never, through all ages, had aught but idols reigned, the name of Christ might reign and be adored, in the realization of the prediction that "the Lord shall be known to Egypt, and the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day; whom the Lord of Hosts shall bless, saying, "BLESSED BE EGYPT, MY PEOPLE." It was a moment of intense interest, a moment, for which alone one might be willing to cross the Atlantic, and traverse the Nile. Often, wandering in that romantic valley, did it strike the mind as a strange thing, that the church of Christ, in my native land, in all her missionary plans and supplications, had so totally neglected that definite promise to plead, and the nation, of whom it is recorded in the Scriptures. Thither the providence of God is now turning the attention of the world, and is preparing the valley of the Nile to become one of the brightest fields of successful missionary operation.

In the work of preparation, which God is thus carrying on with kings and empires, and the very elements of nature, his missionaries, under his own divine guidance, are co-operating, in the establishment of schools, the preparation of instruments to work with, the publication of lexicons, tracts, and translations of the Scriptures, the surveying of countries, and the selection of missionary stations. It is the same labor, which has always been found necessary at the foundation of every great enterprise, and at the commencement of every great era of God's dispensations in the world. It was necessary on a great scale previous to the coming of Christ upon earth; and the same voice, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord," is now rolling over the nations. The ideas of the church have been greatly corrected by this laborious discipline. At the outset our views were both romantic and crude; both churches and missionaries seemed to feel as if any other work than the immediate preaching of the cross to all nations were beneath our regard. Experience is the

great teacher: for the preaching of the gospel neither a pulpit nor a set audience is necessary; God himself is setting the example, and correcting our opinions, in preparing his highways ere he pours out his Spirit. In this country a race of preachers has been training, Sabbath Schools have been in operation; Biblical literature has been advancing; the Spirit of God has been poured out in revivals; a great practical school for missionaries afforded; bands of missionaries provided; the Seamen's Friend Societies in successful operation; Tract and Temperance Societies established prosperously; all the elements of missionary power and greatness gathering together. Our commerce has been extending, and abroad, the enterprise of travellers, and the researches of missionaries already in the field, have increased our geographical knowledge, and from regions hallowed as the birthplace of the Scriptures, have brought back new light for their illustration. In all things the prediction of God is fulfilling, that the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun sevenfold as the light of seven days, in the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of his people.

As the increase of light upon the Scriptures is one of the modes of preparation for the work of missions, a vast accession of light and knowledge for their illustration will doubtless result from that work; it will follow the application of the mind of those nations, to the study of the Scriptures, in the midst of whom the events transacted and the scenes recorded in the Scriptures had their origin. The whole oriental mind is yet to be awakened and disciplined by the Bible, and is then to turn upon the illustration of the Bible the peculiar powers so prepared and directed. Such an era would be somewhat like the application of a new speculum in the telescope, to carry the range of our vision still further than it has ever yet travelled among the heavenly bodies. When the Jewish mind, redeemed and returned from its waste and dispersion, purified from the blindness of infidelity, and armed with the power of faith, shall be concentrated, amidst the lovely hallowed plains and hillsides of Judea, upon the adoring study of those wonderful prophecies, so long veiled, and that wonderful subject of prophecy, so long rejected, can we possibly think that no new light will issue from the change? Or that, when the Indian mind, delivered from

the thraldom of its caste, its Vishnus, and its strange, prodigious superstitions, shall be turned with the same heaven-descended discipline upon the same heaven-inspired records, there will be no results of interest in the quickening of our religious studies into new life? Or that, when a nation tinged by the mysterious peculiarities of thought and feeling induced by an abode of ages on the borders of the Nile, shall be employed with the same believing zeal upon the same holy volume, there will arise out of this order of students nothing to contribute to our store of knowledge, nothing to enlarge the horizon of our views? If each individual human mind is like a prism, that throws the clear sunlight with some new shade of beauty over every object on which it is turned, the individual mind of nations is so too; a prism vast and magnificent enough to reveal new wonders for the world's admiration. And as the Bible is God's book of instruction and education for the world in all its generations, and for nations, with all their distinctive peculiarities of character and habits, there is probability in the idea, that many a mount of vision is to be scaled, as yet unmeasured, and many a valley of thought to be laid open, as yet completely hidden, for the discovery of which we wait the application of particular national minds, or of minds formed under particular national influences.

England and America have taken the lead in the work of missions, but it is not these nations only, by whom God is now moving in these mighty arrangements. The Protestants in France and Switzerland are rising to the work. In that very nation, where, a few years ago, the sun and the stars seemed blotted from existence in the spiritual firmament, where infidelity was worshipped as wisdom, and death publicly proclaimed an eternal sleep, so great a change even now is witnessed, that Bible, Tract, Evangelical, and Missionary Societies are not only formed, but in energetic operation. The sons of them that afflicted the Church come bending unto Zion, and the picture in the 60th chapter of Isaiah's prophecy seems destined, even in its minutest details, to a visible realization.

It is not possible to look upon a more sublime spectacle than that which rises to the mind of a spiritual observer at the present crisis. A voice like the archangel's trumpet is crying, Cast up, cast up the highway, gather out the stones,

lift up a standard to the people! Event rolls on after event. Nothing in haste, but all with an awful deliberation and grandeur, becoming Him, to whom one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years are as one day. As the purposes of God are advancing nearer to their completion, ten thousand significant incidents sweep onward in the train. The convergency of all things to the point becomes more and more rapid. Meaning begins to appear in movements before shrouded in mystery. An omnipotent plan, it is manifest, is in operation, and the trains laid with Divine wisdom are fast completing. They connect, it has well been said, with piles of combustible materials all over the world; it is only for the fire of heaven to fall upon them, and suddenly the whole scene will be lighted up with a transcendent spiritual glory. The way is preparing for nations to be born in a day; when the materials are once in readiness, there is no reason to suppose that the world's conversion may not take place suddenly, with great rapidity. The preparation being made, as before the coming of Christ in person, the Lord, whom we seek, shall, as then, suddenly come to his temple, even the Messenger of the covenant whom we delight in. *I will shake the heavens and the earth, and the sea and the dry land, saith the Lord of Hosts; and I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come.*

For the complete fulfilment of prophecy, but one thing is needed; a baptism of the Spirit, commensurate in extent and glory with the extent and greatness of the preparatory movements in the providence of God. Already it seems to have commenced, and we hear from the Islands of the Sea, and from Northern India, of effusions of the Spirit almost, if not quite, equal to those of the day of Pentecost. That the gift may be continued, one thing is essential,—a spirit of grace and of supplication in the Churches. The movements of God's providence, and those mighty revivals of religion, are a voice to every individual Christian, Enter into thy closet, and shut the door about thee, and pray to thy Father which seeth in secret. When this is done faithfully, prophecies will speedily become realities, and when prophecy is all fulfilled, when the prayers of saints, from generation to generation presented before the throne of God, are completely answered, then will be a scene of God's

glory, such as neither prophecy nor description can fully paint, and such as our minds at present can reach but with very dim and inadequate conceptions.

Blessed is he, praying, laboring, or suffering, whose heart is in the work of the advancing kingdom of the Lord. He shall see its glory consummated, if not in this world, from a post of observation amidst

————"the sanctities of Heaven."

ARTICLE IV.

MANNER IN THE PREACHER.

By Rev. George Shepard, Prof. Sac. Rhet. in the Theol. Seminary, Bangor, Me.

THERE are two things which must combine in forming the orator: there are two parts, neither to be abstracted, without destroying the completeness of the product. The first is good matter; the second, a good manner. The former is the more indispensable of the two. The latter cannot be wanting without great detriment to the former. In this country, we have exalted the former, too much at the expense of the latter. We have not, indeed, thought too highly of good matter; certainly, we have not been guilty of excess in the production of it. We *are* obnoxious to the charge of too much neglecting the manner. If then it be true, that manner is nearly, if not quite, half in the construction of the orator, of the sacred as well as the secular orator, may not a little space be allowed, in which to vindicate and enforce the claims of this exterior part?

And what is meant by manner? We mean by it, every thing of an exterior sort, which comes in requisition in conveying our conceptions to other minds, and in making them vivid and productive there. It is concerned in the full and effective delivery of our thoughts, from ourselves, into our hearers.

A few things may here be designated, which go to make up the idea of a good manner; first premising, however, that it is not an exact, uniform, invariable thing. All good

manner or delivery is no more precisely alike, than all intelligent and beautiful countenances are precisely alike. Each comely face has its own characteristic features. Each impressive and pleasing manner has its own characteristic style. While it violates not palpably the laws of nature and of elocution; it varies, according to the structure, the habits, and taste, of the individual performer. Still there are certain things common to all good delivery.

One is, a considerable strength of voice. Certainly, this is very desirable; a voice of sufficient volume and power to fill all the customary spaces, without pain to ourselves or to others; and always having a quantity in reserve, to expend upon the strong and heavy things, which we may wish to say.

The quality is also to be regarded; pleasantness as well as strength of tone is desirable. A full, round, deep tone is invariably pleasing and acceptable to the auditors. The power of modulation, scope, range of voice, variety of tone, are indispensable to a good manner. On the other hand, monotony of pitch, emphasis, cadence—the beginning, advancing, and ending of every sentence in about the same way, is wholly incompatible with any vivacious and forcible utterance. It is dullness; this tied, slavish uniformity in the particulars named, is, all the world over and down through all generations, dullness and feebleness.

Attitude and gesture are also to be regarded and cultivated, till all gross awkwardness is done away, and a reasonable ease and propriety are attained. Sometimes there appears very great uncouthness. A modern writer tells us, with a little sprinkling of extravagance, "of arms that sail about like the arms of a windmill, and with as little meaning; and of the more common sawing, hammering, and punching, that suggest a doubt whether the man was not intended for a different trade from that of speaking; of a distortion of countenance like that of Piso, who, as Cicero tells us, spake in the Senate with one eyebrow screwed up to the forehead, and the other dropped to a level with the chin."

While all gross awkwardness and uncouthness of gesture should be overcome in our aim after a good manner, we should avoid the palpably artificial. The too measured and studied grace of movement is always inconsistent with a commendable delivery. Gesture is indispensable: the

limbs must speak as well as the voice. But let the thing, by no means, proceed with an obtrusive show of management and calculation. John Randolph is reported to have said, in one of the incoherent ravings of his later days, "that a natural fool is preferable to a learned one." There is much meaning in this declaration, though it seemed to come from the brain of a madman; and it applies in more directions than one. Faults which we acquire; which we fall upon by practice and imitation, are far more offensive, and a much greater detriment to our success than faults which are natural to us; which indeed are strictly our own. More than this; the very excellencies of others, things significant and powerful in those to whom they originally belong, when taken and used by us, become often faulty and feeble things.

The grand excellence of manner throughout is naturalness; by all means natural; our own nature and not another man's. This, even with a degree of roughness and awkwardness, is better than fine and palpable artifice; the studied and mechanical graces of address. Naturalness being the grand excellence, we have a standard, to which we may look, of the fitting and effective in delivery. This standard is found in the manner in which well-bred persons deliver their sentiments, in the private encounter or converse, when they are intently bent upon being understood, assented to and felt.

Earnestness is important as a means of securing naturalness; it is even indispensable to it; and indeed to almost all the desired results of speaking. There cannot be any truly awakening power, where there is a stupid and frozen manner. Palpable truth, so uttered, will hardly be believed. The hearer certainly may deny to the speaker the credit of believing his own message, if he lounges and drawls when uttering the warmest and weightiest sentiments. What should we think of the man who would come and declare to us that his house is in flames with all the calmness, and indifference even, with which he would ask for a coal to kindle a morning blaze. The first impulse would be, to tell him he lied. We do fail often in producing conviction by the truth we employ, because we are destitute of the corresponding emotion. The actor who deals in mere fiction, will agitate, melt, and sway an assembly, whilst those, who

deal in infinitely momentous truth, frequently diffuse abroad indifference and drowsiness. Why is it? Because, in the oft-quoted reply of Betterton to the Bishop of London, "We are in earnest." It is not enough, that the preacher *have* feeling, he must be able to *show* it; to make it flash in the eye, glow in the countenance, tremble and anon thunder in the voice. There are those who have the feeling; keen sensibility, accumulated and struggling emotions, who have but little power of manifestation—somewhat like those volcanic sections, where, for a season, there is a still, calm surface above, and fiery elements heaving and glowing beneath. It is unfortunate where there is this defect in the power of manifestation. Both are important; emotion felt, emotion exhibited: feeling in the heart, feeling in the manner. Together, they constitute the true earnestness; the indispensable attribute in all cogent delivery. Let us have it, even at the expense of some of the minor proprieties,—the more genteel graces of the manner. The earnest speaker, even if tolerable in other respects, will be regarded.

On the value or importance, to the speaker and to others, of the accomplishment which has been described, namely, a good manner or delivery, I am prepared to take strong ground; prepared to say, even, that it is almost, if not quite, fundamental to any very extended success. There is a foundation in our nature for a sure effect, in all instances of agreeable, warm-hearted address. We are so made, that looks, tones, and gestures, if adjusted according to nature, and the offspring of a living soul within, arrest and move us. There is something in our breasts, which solicits the orator's touch, and which is quick and generous in its response. "The multitude," says a fervid writer, "are ready to swallow any thing that comes in the shape of rhetoric. They are hungering and thirsting for it; they are lifting up their souls for it, to the pulpit, the bar, to the senate chamber: they are ready to be instructed; to be moved; to be aroused, transported,—yes, the most obstinate are willing to be enlightened, the most obdurate to be melted, the dullest to be charmed, if the power and the wisdom come in the form of eloquence."

My first remark, illustrative of the importance and value of a good manner is, that a good manner or delivery helps to get out and construct good matter. The good speaker, as com-

pared with the poor one, other things being equal, will have the best matter. Certainly, as a general thing, he will have his matter in the best shape. May not the delivery influence the style, and the very strength of the matter in the following way? A good, forcible, emphatic delivery, abiding as a living idea in the mind, constitutes a standard, to which the expression or wording of the thoughts is brought. The writer, having this idea of emphatic speaking, will not be satisfied, till he has formed an emphatic sentence. If he has wrought himself to pith and point in his delivery, he will be likely to work himself to pith and point in his preparation. Indeed, the process and approach to this desired form will be almost spontaneous. The mould being in the mind, if the matter be warm and pliable, it can hardly avoid the shape prescribed by the standard. If admitted to the secrets of oratorical composition, I doubt not we should find, that the best thoughts are brought out and thrown into a harmonious and vigorous expression, by the aid of a simultaneous and real, though perhaps, mental enunciation of them. In this way, they are brought to the mould and admeasurement of a powerful delivery. If they are not large enough, he will throw them away. If they will not take a bold shape, he will throw them away, and gather up his strength and toil at the fountain, till something proceeds, which better comports with his standard, and which will better answer his purpose. Perhaps it will be denied, that our matter is essentially better for having a better shape: in other words, that the *manner* of the matter is of much importance. To the man who speaks his matter, the shape of it is of the very first importance. The matter may be good, very sensible, and seemingly powerful, and on being spoken, fail, to a great extent, of its designed effect, for the want of the oratorical shape and spirit. It should be brisk, pointed, of a certain close, solid texture; projectile in its tendency, so that we can seem to throw the sentences at, and into, the minds and hearts of men. Our doctrine is, the true oratorical manner, not the artificial and declamatory, but the good, natural, earnest delivery, will help those who have it, in the production of the true, cogent, oratorical style. They will be far more likely to execute that style, than the dull, unmeaning, monotonous speaker.

A good manner is of service to a preacher in furnishing

him with a field, where he may stand and proclaim the truths of the gospel. Having first helped him to matter of a better sort and shape, it then helps him to a place, where he may statedly deliver it and witness and cherish its effects upon the souls of men. If any doubt that mere manner renders any service of this sort, let the experiment be tried. Let there be sent forth into the great field, two candidates for settlement. One of them shall be respectable in the customary talents and acquisitions, but shall excel as a speaker; his voice and manner shall be uncommonly good—his delivery both pleasing and impressive. The other shall excel the preceding, very much, in power and richness of mind, and in the extent of his acquisitions; but he shall be tame and ordinary, in all respects, as a speaker. The former will be called for settlement three times, while the latter will be once. Every body knows this, who has taken any notice of the judgments which our parishes generally form of successive and differing candidates. We may exclaim for our comfort, that they are fools for being caught with mere wind and manner,—for thus preferring show and sound to sense. Yes, and fools they will be, as long as they live, or the world stands. Indeed, fools in this respect, God has made them; and it is our business to accommodate ourselves to the natures they have; for they do think and *will* think, a great deal of manner; not only the accomplished, the most uncultivated want a good manner. It comes to us from the hill-top and the valley, from the woods and the cleared land—"send us a smart man," which, in most cases, means, to no small extent, send us a good, animated, stirring speaker.

When the preacher is fixed in his field, a good delivery will help him to an auditory. It will increase the number of his hearers. It has great power to draw in those who are not interested in the truth. Even those, who are stupidly indifferent and positively opposed, will be drawn out by the attraction of manner; and to no small extent, by a simply agreeable manner. Whitfield had an extraordinary manner. It is true, that what he was, and did, in this respect, few, perhaps no others, can be and do. Still it was his manner,—the way he said things, more than the things he said, which brought around him those assemblages of five, ten, and twenty thousand, who hung upon his lips and

were swayed by his appeals. Where the preacher is propounding new truths, as Whitfield did; or is laboring in a new field, where the work is, the bringing together of rough and scattered materials and the building of them into a spiritual edifice, as is the case in a large proportion of the fields in our land, it is even more important that a good, earnest manner be employed, than in the more cultivated sections; where the attachments and habits of the people will, in part, make up for the deficiencies of the preacher. We feel tempted to stop here just long enough to rap that mischievous old heresy, that an inferior and feebler style of matter and manner will answer for the newer places. It is a monstrously perverse idea. It would be well for us even to turn about our notions on this point, and send the strongest men where there is the heaviest and most difficult labor to be done. If you send forth into a new field a sensible man, of good energetic delivery, the people will turn out to hear him. But if he is awkward, especially if he is dull, no matter how wise, the people will mind their own business, and leave him to discourse to pine boards or empty seats, or to explode his wisdom into vacuity.

A good delivery will not only help the preacher to *hearers*, but also to *a hearing*. It will not only attract *attendance* but *attention*. Sometimes the attendance is much better than the attention. There is a multitude together, but they are listless, lounging, drowsy, while the discourse is advancing;—a house full of ears, which for the time are recreant to their office. There is a tendency this way in most assemblies, brought together to hear sermons. Assuredly, then, if you put a sleepy man into the pulpit, you will have sleepy men and women too in the pews. If the preacher is monotonous, dull, heavy, he will infallibly turn the church into a dormitory. The farther he goes on, the lower they go down into the regions of lethargy. Most persons, probably, have seen an assembly under this pervading and shameful torpidity;—hearing nothing; feeling nothing; caring for nothing, mainly because the man in the pulpit was a miserable speaker,—throughout the same frozen, depressing thing, the unchangeable monotony of dullness. But just put another man in the place, another voice of cultivated and varying tone, another eye and action, diffusing the warmth of the awakened spirit within; and the profane

loungers will begin to look and listen; prostrate ears to stand erect; lethargic minds to move; benumbed consciences to throb; frigid hearts to feel. There is always hope of this, when the people hear; for faith comes by hearing,—not by being in the place of hearing, in the attitude of hearing;—if it comes at all, it comes by actually hearing. I do not then exaggerate the importance of hearing, nor of good delivery, as adapted to secure hearing. Every public speaker soon finds that it depends about as much upon the power and tones of his voice, the glance of his eye, the propriety and force of his action, as upon any thing else, whether he shall hold or lose the attention of his auditory. This undoubted and almost invariable experience, constitutes a very weighty argument, for the ability to deliver our matter with significance and effect.

This leads me to say, further, that a good delivery does augment the force and effect of the matter upon the minds of those who really attend to it. It has already been said, that a good manner ensures an increased *intrinsic* force to the matter we produce. It is now added, that a good manner augments the force of the matter executively,—that is, the same matter will do more execution upon those who listen, when well delivered, than when ill delivered. Said Æschines to an assembly, who were greatly moved by the reading to them of one of the orations of Demosthenes, "What if you had *heard* him?" This rival and enemy of the orator knew, that the effect would have been tenfold greater.

The delivery is an exposition. More meaning comes out in the case of apt delivery; and the meaning, which does come forth by the fitness and force of delivery, acquires thereby a vivacity and impulse, that carries it more largely and deeply into the minds of the listeners. Indeed, manner has a power often beyond exposition. It conveys meaning where otherwise there would be none. Itself is the meaning and the matter; and occasionally, in the hands of a master, it has an almost incredible power. When Lord Chatham turned upon the House of Commons in one of their insolent moods and pronounced the word, "sugar," (with which he had just commenced his speech,) three times, with a mien, tone and look, which made the whole body to tremble and quail before him, he showed the truly terrible

meaning, mere manner can give to that which by itself has no meaning.

It must be confessed, that there is, sometimes, a kind of illusion wrought upon us by manner. What is strong, seems stronger, when skilfully pronounced, than it really is; what is rich, a little richer; what is beautiful and tender, a little more so, than they really are. And if by some mishap of the brain, there falls out a feeble paragraph, or a whole barren discourse, the man of cultivated voice and manner will contrive, by the music of the one, and the charm of the other, to carry his hearers over the heath, both comfortably to them, and reputably to himself. When through, they will really think, and some will say, "It was very fine." It is a fact, all the land over, that a smooth tongue is no mean apology for an empty head.

But let it be distinctly understood, that this is not the ground, on which we urge the cultivation of that member. This very power of illusion only shows more clearly, the power and the worth, to the honest man—the man of God—of a good delivery. We have seen—indeed, a world full of facts compels us to see—that by the help of it he draws around him a broader and thicker field of heads and hearts; wields against them better prepared instruments, with stronger and sharper purpose and aim; and, of course, produces upon them more extensive and lasting effects. It comes then to this; that the character of deathless souls, their redemption or perdition, is directly affected by the preacher's attainments and deficiences in respect to manner.

A question here springs forth:—How much is practicable? May preachers, as a general thing, reach the agreeable and forcible in delivery, or are they, with a few exceptions, shut up, by the very structure of their "outer man" doomed to dullness and stupidity? No: the agreeable and forcible in manner, may be reached by us with as much certainty as we obtain other things, if we would only try for this, as we try for other things. The opinion is advanced from an authoritative quarter, "that if there were effort and painstaking at all corresponding to the value of the attainment, the proportion, as now existing, would be reversed; and instead of nine out of ten being dull, the nine would, at times, be truly eloquent, and the one only inveterately dull." Those who have attempted reformation and

improvement with every thing against them, have brought about wonders for themselves and the world. The late Dr. Porter informs us that, in middle life, he went to work and broke up a stiff and clumsy pair of jaws, and from an afflictive monotony passed, as we know, to a range and flexibility of tone, adequate to the highest purposes of the orator. Demosthenes was, in the first instance, hissed from the rostrum for very badness of manner. He went out and went to work, and ere long returned with a power of manner, by which, with the aid of well compacted matter, he agitated, swayed, and impelled the nation at his pleasure. These results came from effort; an earnest attention to the thing.

But the difficulty now is, we refuse to give any tolerable degree of attention to it: not that a good manner is really despised, but we think, if it comes at all, it will come of its own accord. True, we have to labor for other attainments, and we are willing to labor. Years must be expended in effort before we can master the flute or the organ. "Yet we will imagine," says Prof. Ware, "that the grandest, the most various, the most expressive of all instruments which the Creator has fashioned, by the union of an intellectual soul with the powers of speech, may be played upon without study or practice. We come to it uninstructed, unpractised, and think to manage all its stops, and command the whole compass of its varied and comprehensive power." True, all men of finished and powerful address, in far preceding time, reached their high position by study, toil, and practice, which continued even through life. The labor and painstaking of the great Grecian orator have been alluded to. It is said, that he shaved one half of his head, that he might compel himself to continue in a course of solitary drilling and training, till the utmost skill and power were reached. We are told, "that Cæsar, at the head of an army, surrounded by the anxieties and perils of war, maintained the practice of daily declaiming in his tent." We are told, that Cicero was constant and earnest in the same practice, not only through his novitiate, but even after he had attained the pre-eminent position of prince of orators. Whitfield was indefatigable in the same way. His cultivation of manner continued through life. "Foote and Garrick were accustomed to maintain that his oratory was not at its full height, till he had repeated a discourse forty times." From this interest in, and attention to, their manner, came

the power of these men in the delivery of their thoughts. But most now are pretty much willing to let this thing take care of itself, and if they come out tolerable speakers, very well; if they come out intolerable ones, so be it; those who hear must endure the infliction as well as they can. Hence it is, in the severe and castigating language of Dr. Rush, "that we need not be surprised, that the pulpit, the senate, the bar, and the chair of medical professorship, are filled with such abominable drawlers, mouthers, mumblers, clutterers, squeakers, chanters, and mongers in monotony."

Now as all this dread discord and mischief proceed from neglect of the art in question, we have only to turn the thing about, and give a reasonable attention to it. There is no other way: we must consent to do as other and better men have done before us. The high resolution and persevering practice, they manifested, will do almost any thing. Let any man of tolerable powers try,—enter upon the work of correction and improvement; let him fix in his mind some common sense principles for his guidance; then let him, in some vigorous portion of every day, address himself, heart and soul, lungs and limbs, to the grand achievement of becoming a good speaker; and he will pretty certainly become one. There will ere long be, propriety of action, ease and freedom of utterance; and he will be enabled to baptize, and thoroughly imbue, the sterling sense of his head, with the flowing and gushing sensibilities of his heart, and throw it forth into the minds and hearts of his hearers.

To the private practice, there should be added, when practicable, a degree of exposure, particularly in young men. There cannot be spared, even in our highest seminaries, the immemorial exercise of public declamation. True, it is despised by many, as boyish business; still it is one of the best ways to give our students the front and bearing of men. It is valuable for the drilling it ensures. It is valuable for the exposure to which it compels. In this way, Whitfield first learned, as he informs us, to face the thousands that thronged around him. What can any one do without self-possession? Awkwardness and blunders are inevitable without it. It is by exposure alone that we acquire this self-possession. Surely, it is well for the young man to try and obtain it, in the preparatory stage;—far better than, through fear or some other cause, to forego the exposure and the practice, in this stage, and thus to let the

fear and awkwardness grow upon him, as he grows older and larger, and then when obliged to make his public appearance, to go into the holy place more like a culprit than a preacher, and stand there through the discomfiting hour, as on Belshazzar's knees, and imagine that he beholds, on every section of the wall, terrifically inscribed, the "mene tekel" of failure.

The fear might be avoided, and a commendable aptness and power of address obtained, if those interested would only set themselves, in the way intimated, to the work of correction, and prosecute it to a just extent. Even large portions of time, in the case of many students, may be devoted, with a good conscience, to the accomplishments of manner. Better do it, and then go forth to the work, with this potent auxiliary, than neglect the cultivation, and go forth, the replete and finished scholar within, and the stupid, unpractised stammerer without.

Let us look, for a moment, at the reason, the fitness of the thing. Is it not altogether reasonable and proper, that prominent and continued regard be had to the attainment, by which, as preachers, all the rest are to be made available, to the high purposes of our profession? Is it not monstrous folly, to spend the best years of life, in devoted study, in disciplining the mind, enlarging its capacities, and filling them as they grow, with truth and knowledge, there to stay pent up in darkness, because the power of communication was shamefully neglected—the rich and swelling resources, of little credit to himself, and less use to the world, because the voice and manner, the appointed agents to diffuse and impress, were never trained to their office? We need a little of the spirit manifested by Richard Brinsley Sheridan, who, having grievously failed in an early effort on the floor of the Commons, and being thereupon advised by his friends to abandon the idea of becoming a speaker in that connection, replied, with an erect, undaunted mien: "Never. I know it is in me, and I am determined that it shall come out." We have heard the opinion expressed, that there is more in most of our educated preachers, than they succeed in getting out. There is enough in them, if they would but get it out. Certainly, it can do no good, until they do get it out, and send it forth upon the world, under a vigorous form and impulse.

In this view there is solemn obligation resting upon us.

Are we not, as ambassadors of Christ, bound, by the law of love, to attend more to this thing? To the warmly benevolent mind, what an incitement to the culture of the power of address, lies in the fact, that among all the endowments of the Creator, it is our greatest and best power of good. The living voice is the grand, ordained instrument of the world's awakening and redemption. Shall not heaven's unchanging ordinance be regarded and obeyed in the better cultivation of that voice?

"Whitfield," says his biographer, "sought out acceptable tones and gestures and looks, as well as acceptable words. Was Whitfield right? Then many, like myself, are far wrong. Let the rising ministry take warning. Awkwardness in the pulpit is a sin;—monotony is a sin;—dullness is a sin;—and all of them sins against the welfare of immortal souls." As preachers of the gospel, how can we get clear of the conviction, that we are as really in fault before God, if our hearers go to perdition because our manner is stupid and wrong, needlessly so, as we shall be, if they go there because our heart is wrong. And how should we feel, to know, that some are hopeless wailers in the pit, because we were incorrigible drawlers in the pulpit?

The attainment of a good delivery is, in the preacher surely, a beneficent attainment, reaching forward and upward, in its results, to the world of celestial glory.

The nobleness of the attainment is another consideration. The tongue, according to the sacred poet, is the glory of our frame. An eloquent tongue, joined with an eloquent mind, rich in knowledge, powerful in conception, fitting and forcible in delivery, is a double glory; especially when employed in the advocacy of the gospel,—imparting greatness to its disclosures, worth and weight to its interests, and urgency to its claims,—making men see the majesty and feel the power of truth, in their recovery to the image and spirit of the Holy. It is the most noble, and on the last day, destined I doubt not, to be amongst the most honored of all earthly powers,—the power of persuading guilty men to become reconciled to God. Those who cultivate and exercise this power, under the impulsive influence of a holy mind, may expect to abound here in truly imperishable achievements, and will there be raised to shine, as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars for ever and ever.

ARTICLE V.

The Piety of the Early Christians.

By C. E. Stowe, D. D., Prof. of Biblical Literature, Lane Seminary, Cincinnati.

An inspired writer and the wisest of kings has said, "Say not thou, What is the cause that the former days were better than these? for thou dost not inquire wisely concerning this." Eccl. 7: 10. It is however the declaration of a prophet, "Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls." Jer. 6: 16.

Certainly it is not every old way that is a good way, in which one can find rest for his soul, for we also read in the Bible of "the old way which wicked men have trodden, who were cut down out of time." Job 22: 16. Indeed, as human nature is always the same depraved fountain of ill, old ways, so far as men are concerned, are quite as likely to be wrong as new ones. As the truth of God, however, is one and unchangeable, if there has ever been a time when the truth was clearly manifested on the earth, and exerted its legitimate influence, that period must, on this point, be a safe pattern for all subsequent time.

There was once a time when the Christian church, without any aid from miraculous power, without any support from the institutions and customs of society, or any protection from the civil government, but in direct opposition to all the habits and professions of the civilized world, and encountering the bloodiest persecutions from the secular arm, did hold its ground and make its way by its own native energies; when it did manifest itself as the kingdom of God, which cometh not with observation or outward show, swaying men in masses by an external power; but like the little leaven leavening the whole lump, gradually and silently converting the surrounding mass into its own substance, by moving from heart to heart, subduing each individual will, and embracing in its empire only voluntary subjects. There was a time when the church, by its internal power only, without any thing else in its favor, "subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped

the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens." Heb. 11: 33–35.

There have, indeed, been several such periods in the history of the Christian church, but I now refer particularly to the time which intervened between the close of the apostolic age and the commencement of the reign of Constantine. At this period Christians had all the world against them, and nothing in their favor but the common converting and sanctifying influences of the Spirit, such as belong to the church in every age, and their own good conduct as soldiers of Jesus Christ. Yet they prevailed, and religion gained ground faster, on the whole, than it has ever done since. It would be profitable for us to ascertain, if possible, the secret of this great power, and learn to walk in the footsteps of those who were in the habit of *following the Lamb whithersoever he goeth.* We are apt, though without any good reason for the prejudice, to despair of the virtues of the apostolic age, as something by us unattainable, because the church then possessed miraculous powers; but the succeeding age, which had no superiority over us in respect to miracles, and was far inferior to us in regard to all other advantages, whether moral or physical; this age, certainly, offers us an attainable object of emulation.

In treating this subject, I shall endeavor to exhibit,

I. The principles and sentiments of the early Christians in respect to God and his word, and the Lord Jesus Christ, in respect to themselves, their brethren, and the surrounding world.

II. Their feelings and conduct, in the church, in the business of life, in the intercourse and recreations of society, and in their families.

The picture will be made out principally by brief extracts from contemporaneous writings, both of the Christians themselves and their opponents.*

---

* My quotations and references are made out principally by the aid of the following guides, namely: Neander's Denkwuerdigkeiten, and Kirchen-Geschichte, Tertullian, Gieseler's Kirchen-Geschichte, and Gottfried Arnold's Kirchen-und Ketzer-Geschichte.

I. What were the principles and sentiments of these Christians,—

1. In respect to God and his word and the Lord Jesus Christ?

They had an inward, deep consciousness that the almighty, the omniscient, the all-holy God, the Creator and Redeemer of heaven and earth, the Author and Sustainer of all existence, was *their* God. *They walked with God* in all the varied scenes of their lives, they were conscious of communion with God, of a daily interchange of thought, feeling, and sympathy between them and their heavenly Father, as a man is conscious of such intercommunion of feeling between himself and his most intimate companion. It was something altogether different from what they had ever known previous to their conversion to the Christian faith, and to which the world around them were still entire strangers. They realized continually in their own consciousness the complete fulfilment of our Saviour's declaration, "If a man love me he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." John 14: 23.

Hence the word of God was to them *lively oracles;* they were in the habit of constantly consulting it and implicitly relying upon it—not as a collection of proof-texts to sustain particular dogmas, not as a store-house for controversial argument against their fellows, not as a book of good advice merely—but as a development of the mind of God, speaking to their hearts for their encouragement, confirmation, and inward enjoyment. They felt all the veneration and joyous certainty and implicit confidence in reading the sacred books that could have been experienced by the pious high priest under the old dispensation, when he went into the holy of holies to consult the miraculous oracle of Urim and Thummim.

To the question which was often proposed to Christians, "Who is this God whom you worship in secret without ceremonies, without images, temples or altars?" Theophilus of Antioch replies, "He it is whose breath gives life to every thing which exists; should he withdraw his breath all would sink to nothing. You cannot speak without bearing testimony of him; thy very breath bears testimony of him, and yet ye know him not. This happens through the blind-

ness of your soul, the stupidity of your heart. God might be seen by you if the eye of your soul were open. All have eyes, but the eyes of some are darkened that they cannot see the light of the sun, but it follows not thence that the sun shines not. The blind may blame themselves and their own eyes only. So, O man, the eyes of thy soul are darkened by sin. The man must have his soul pure like a clear mirror. If there be sin in man it is like dirt on a mirror. Such a man cannot see God. But whenever thou wilt thou canst be healed. Give thyself to the physician and he will open the eyes of thy soul and heart. Who is this physician? God, who by his word heals and makes alive." (Neander, Denkw. I. 276.)

Says Marcion, "The God of holiness and love, whom I find in the Gospels, was till now unknown in the world. Neither nature nor reason could lead to him. The God whom nature and reason make known, is not the God most high revealed in Christ. In the limited, weak nature of man, there is no relationship to this almighty, holy God. Christianity first flowing out from this God, imparts divine life to man, by which he is elevated above the finite creation to communion with this Infinite Being of holiness and love." (Tertul. against Marc. I. 10, 11.)

Says Cyprian, "The Lord teaches us to pray in silence, in our secret chambers. We know that God is everywhere present, he sees and hears every thing; with the fulness of his might he penetrates the most secret corners. God hears not the voice, but the heart."

They regarded Jesus Christ not only as their Saviour and their God, their almighty Redeemer, on whom they depended for every blessing for time and eternity; but also as their pattern and exemplar, whose conduct they were to imitate in all the circumstances of their lives. They sustained themselves in toil, in affliction, in persecution, in all kinds of provocation, by a lively conception of what Jesus was and how he demeaned himself in all the trying circumstances of his benevolent life; and they were ashamed even to wish to do less and to bear less for their own salvation and that of their fellows, than he was willing to do and bear for his enemies and persecutors.

This may be illustrated by the work of Tertullian on Christian patience or meekness, (de patientia,) which he

defines to be a "divine disposition proceeding from a living and heavenly disposition, and not a human affectation of dogged equanimity originating in stupor!" "God himself, (says he) is to us the pattern of patience, since he gives the dew of his light and all the gifts of nature equally to the whole human race, both to the worthy and the unworthy. Our blessed Saviour—he never rejected any who wished to come to him; no table, no family did he ever despise; he called even publicans and sinners. He indulged no anger against the city which refused him shelter and food, upon which his disciples would call down fire from heaven for its shameful treatment of him. He healed the ungrateful, he glided away from those who lay in wait for him; and though he had his betrayer always with him, he never upbraided him for his treacherous dealings. When he was delivered up, he went like a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep under the hand of her shearer is dumb, so he opened not his mouth. He who with one word could have commanded legions of angels to his aid, would not accept the avenging sword of a disciple. He who veiled himself in human form, could not consent to imitate human impatience. O ye Pharisees! herein especially ought ye to have recognised your Lord, for such patience and meekness mere human nature could never have exhibited.

The old law said, 'an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.' Meekness was not yet upon the earth because faith was not yet upon the earth. The Lord and Master of meekness must first appear. After he had appeared, and had, by patience, established the grace of faith, wrath was forbidden and the poison was taken away from the tongue. The law has won more than it has lost, since Christ says, 'Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, pray for your persecutors, that you may be the children of your heavenly Father.' See of what a father patience makes you the children.

Heavenly Patience!—She fortifies faith, she commands peace, she sustains love, she lays the foundation of humility, she controls the flesh, she guards the soul, she drives away offences, she perfects martyrdom, she comforts the poor, she gives moderation to the rich, she drives not the weak beyond their strength, she wastes not the might of the strong, she quickens the believer, she kindly allures the unbeliever, she gains for the servant the approbation of the

master, for the master the approbation of God. She is lovely in the child, praiseworthy in the youth, venerable in the aged.

Would we make a picture of Patience? Gentle quiet rests upon her countenance, her forehead is smooth without a fold, there is no wrinkle of discontent or anger, her brows are never knit with anxious cares, her eyes are never cast down with the feeling of misery. A white robe enfolds her bosom; there is the throne of the Spirit with the still small voice which once appeared to Elijah. Where God is, there is his daughter Patience,. When the Spirit of God descends to the earth, Patience accompanies him; she is his inseparable companion. Will, then, the Spirit of God dwell long with us, unless we receive her also with him? Without her, his companion and servant, he must, in every place and at all times feel himself straitened. Against the attacks of the adversary he cannot long hold out alone without the companionship of Patience. Such is the motive, such is the conduct, such are the works of the patience which is genuine and heavenly, and which may truly be called spiritual. This is quite a different thing from the false and shameful hardihood of the world. Let us love the patience of God, the patience of Christ; let us give that again to him which he has given for us. Let us who believe in the resurrection of the spirit and the flesh, let us offer to him the patience of the spirit and the flesh. O let the whole world be taken from me if I can only gain patience!"

With such principles and sentiments, their convictions were always lively, their works always vigorous, their feelings were always tender and susceptible of religious impressions. How can he be dull in his religious emotions who lives in actual contact with heaven? How can he be unspiritual and earthly in his affections to whom the Divine presence is constantly matter of consciousness? 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.' And how can he be impatient and fretful under the disappointments and afflictions of this world, who is in the habit of dwelling on what Christ did and suffered for him?

In regard to the Scriptures, Cyril of Jerusalem exclaims, "Let only the things which are written be spoken by us; if any thing be not written, we have little concern with it. The Holy Spirit himself dictated the Scriptures; where-

fore let that which he spake be read, for whatever he did not speak we should not venture upon."

2. What were the principles and sentiments of these Christians in respect to themselves?

They viewed themselves as soldiers on active and arduous duty in an enemy's country; and as such they looked not for ease or personal gratification, or permanent possessions in this world. Says Tertullian, (ad Mar. c. 3,) "We have been called to a knighthood of the living God, and we took the soldier's oath at the time of our baptism. No warrior goes with all his conveniences and out of his chamber to battle; but from the camp, where he is inured to hardship and accustomed to all kinds of inconvenience. Even in peace, soldiers learn, by labor and toilsomeness, to bear the hardships of war, being constantly under arms, exercising themselves in the field, and throwing up trenches. So, ye blessed ones, regard every thing that is hard to you as an exercise of your mental and bodily powers. Ye serve in a good camp, where the living God is your general, where the Holy Ghost directs the camp-exercises, and an angel's life in heaven, eternal glory, is the victor's reward."

Like soldiers on active duty, they expected to endure hardship, to encounter fatigue, to be ready for every sacrifice, to avoid all the snares and stratagems of the enemy to draw them from their duty, and to look for cessation from toil and danger, to expect the reward of victory, only when the campaign should be over. This idea kept them always watchful, careful, willing to encounter fatigue, and to practise self-denial.

Further, they viewed themselves as the priests of God, placed in a polluted world to sanctify it, to be purified temples in which the Holy Spirit might dwell, safe from the contact of surrounding corruption, to be purified channels in which the sweet influences of heaven, the rills from the river of life, which surrounds the throne of God, might freely flow to purify a world which lay in wickedness.

"We," says Justin Martyr, (Dial. Tryph. 355,) "are the true high priests of God, as God himself testifies, when he says that pleasant incense and a pure offering shall in every place among the heathen be offered to him. (Mal. 1: 11.) He receives offerings from none but his priests. Prayer and thanksgiving only, brought by the worthy, are genuine offer-

ings well pleasing to God; and those Christians alone are in a condition to give." Says Ireneus, (iv. 20,) "All the righteous have the sacerdotal dignity." Says Tertullian, (de Orat. c. 28,) "We are the true worshippers and the true priests, who, praying in the Spirit, in the Spirit offer to God the prayer which is his due, and is well-pleasing to him. Such prayer, coming from a heart full of devotion, nourished by faith, kept pure by a blameless life, made glorious by love, and accompanied with good works, we must with psalms and hymns bring to the altar of God; and it is all which God requires of us."

Celsus objected to the Christians, that they had no temples, nor images, nor altars, like the professors of other religions; and Origen appropriately replies, (against Celsus, Lib. V,) "He sees not that with us the souls of the righteous are the altars from which, in a true and spiritual manner, offerings well pleasing to God ascend, prayer from a pure conscience. The images and gifts worthy of God are not made with hands, but they are formed by God's word—they are the virtues by which we are conformed to the Fist-born of every creature, in whom is the ideal of all righteousness and wisdom. The most glorious image, elevated far above the whole creation, is truly in our Saviour, who could say of himself, *The Father is in me.* (John 10: 38.) But also in every one of those who according to their power imitate him, is the image of him who hath created him, as it proceeds from looking to God with a pure heart. And generally all Christians seek to erect in their hearts, such altars and images—not the lifeless, emotionless things of idolatrous worship, but those in which the Spirit of God may dwell, which unite themselves with its life. This the sacred Scriptures show when God promised the righteous, I will walk among you and be your God, and ye shall be my people (Lev. 26: 12); and the Saviour, when he said, If any man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him, and make our abode with him." (John 14: 18.)

This idea kept them always deeply serious, pure minded, and careful to do nothing, to make no compliances with the customs of the world, which they supposed would injure their influence or soil their purity as priests of the most high God. For this reason they would never accept the subterfuges which heathen magistrates offered them, for the pur-

pose of evading the laws that required them to join in idolatrous worship. Some would offer to give them a certificate that they had sacrificed when they had not; but this they always declined, as being as much a denial of Christ as the sacrificing itself. When they were required to burn their Bibles, some magistrates would tell them that they might seem to comply with the law by burning other books instead of their Bibles; but such a law they would not even seem to obey; though they were scrupulous to obey the magistrate in all his requirements which did not come in direct conflict with their obligations to God. Says Tertullian, "We pray for all our emperors, that long life, a quiet reign, a brave army, a faithful senate, a true-hearted people, a secure government, and every thing which a man or an emperor can wish, may be theirs."

There was then no such distinction between clergymen and laymen, that compliances which would be acknowledged improper in the one would yet be considered harmless in the other. They were all equally the priests of God, and as such they felt their responsibilities, and as such they endeavored to keep themselves unspotted from the world, and always to maintain the grave and serious demeanor becoming in a priest of the Most High. Says Tertullian, (Monog. 7,) "We are priests, called thereto by Christ. The supreme High Priest, the great Priest of the Heavenly Father, even Christ, when he clothed us with that which is his, (for as many of you as are baptized have put on Christ, Gal. 3: 27,) hath made us kings and priests to God and his Father." (Rev. 1: 6.) "We are deluded if we imagine that that is allowed to the layman which is not permitted to the priest. Are not we laymen also priests?" (Exhort. c. 7.)

3. What were the principles and sentiments of these Christians in respect to their brethren?

They viewed their brethren as their fellow-soldiers in a small and compact army, destined to a difficult and dangerous service, where the success and safety of the whole depended on every man's doing his own duty in his own place; where the exertions of every one were needed; and where each soldier felt the necessity of all the support and encouragement which every fellow-soldier could give. With these views there was strong attachment, mutual depend-

ence and confidence, and a desire to make the most of every one's efforts, instead of a contentious, fault-finding, and censorious spirit.

Again, they viewed their brethren as their fellow priests, consecrated with them to the same holy work by the shedding of the same precious blood, to minister together at the same altars while here on earth, and to wear like garlands, and sit on equal thrones in the kingdom of God above. Hence there was strong mutual sympathy, affection and respect throughout the whole body of believers. They felt that they were human and had human infirmities, that the excellency of the power must be of God and not of man; but so intimately connected were they in feeling, interest and effort, that if one member were honored, all rejoiced with him, if one were afflicted, all suffered with him.

It was an amazing spectacle to the selfish pagans of that age, to see that Christians, though entire strangers to each other, the moment they met were on the footing of familiar friendship, and each was always ready to give any thing he possessed to help a brother's necessities.

To those pagans who expressed astonishment at this disinterestedness of Christians towards each other, Tertullian says, (Apol. c. 39), "Your brethren also are one by the rights of a common mother and a common human nature, though you like bad brothers have denied those rights in respect to us. With how much more right, then, may we view ourselves the brethren of those whom God our Father acknowledges, who have received the same spirit of sanctification, who have been rescued from the same abyss of ignorance, to the same light of truth? We who have but one heart and one soul, can have no hesitation to share our earthly goods with each other."

About the middle of the third century, several Christians, male and female, from the Numidian churches in northern Africa, were taken captive by the bordering savage tribes. The Numidian churches were too poor to pay the full ransom demanded, and applied to Carthage for assistance. It was readily granted, to the amount of nearly $4000, and sent to them with a letter from Cyprian the bishop, from which the following are extracts, (Neander, Denkw. I. 340.)

"We could view the captivity of our brethren no otherwise than as our own, since we both belong to one body;

and not only love, but religion also, excites and strengthens us to redeem in our brethren the members of our own body. For the apostle says, 'know ye not that ye are God's temple, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?' (1 Cor. 3: 16.) We must then, even if affection were not sufficient to induce us to help our brethren, we must here reflect that the temples of God are in captivity; and these temples of God ought not by our neglect to remain long in bondage. We must, with all our powers, seek, by our obedience, to gain the approbation of Christ, our Judge, our Lord and God. Since the apostle Paul says, as many of you as are baptized have put on Christ, so in our captive brethren we must see before us Christ, who hath ransomed us from the danger of captivity, who hath redeemed us from the danger of death, him, who hath freed us from the abyss of Satan, who now remains and dwells in us, to free him from the hands of barbarians; with a small sum of money to ransom him, who hath ransomed us by his cross and blood: who hath permitted this to take place that our faith may be proved thereby—whether every one will do that for another, which he would wish might be done for himself, if he were the one held in captivity by the barbarians. We wish indeed that no such thing may happen in future, but should it happen, to prove the love of our hearts and try our faith, neglect not to inform us of it; for be assured that our whole church prays to God, that no such calamity may happen, but should it occur, we will joyfully and liberally aid you."

4. What were the principles and sentiments of these Christians in respect to the unconverted world?

The unconverted world was, in their view, in a state of moral ruin, but a ruin for which an effectual remedy had been provided, a remedy that needed only to be applied to effect the desired cure. Unconverted men were sinners estranged from God, and exposed to eternal separation from him, a separation which would be to them everlasting destruction; yet they were the same kind of men with themselves, having the same nature, the same wants, the same susceptibilities, and as capable as themselves of being made meet to become partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light. Hence, though ill-treated, abused, and shamefully persecuted by their fellow men, they still treated them with respect and affection, as the creatures of their heavenly

Father, as sinners for whom Christ died, and as materials which could be made available to the building up of the kingdom and the temple of their God.

The epistle to Diognetus, written early in the second century,* contains the following description of Christians: "They are not distinguished from other men by their place of residence, their language or manners. Though they live in cities of the Greeks and barbarians, each where his lot is cast, and in clothing, food, and mode of life, follow the customs of their country, yet they are distinguished by a wonderful and universally astonishing walk and conversation. They dwell in their own native land, but as foreigners; they take part in every thing as citizens, they endure every thing as foreigners. Every foreign land is to them as their native country, and their native country as a foreign land. They live in the flesh but not after the flesh. They dwell on the earth, but they live in heaven; they obey the existing laws, but by their life elevate themselves above the laws. They love all men, and are persecuted, misunderstood, and condemned by all. They are slain and made alive, they are poor and make many rich, they suffer want in every thing and possess abundance in every thing; they are cursed and they bless. In one word, what the soul is in the body, that Christians are in the world. As the soul is diffused through all the members of the body, so the Christians are spread through all the cities of the world. The soul indeed dwells in the body, but it is not of the body; so Christians dwell in the world, but they are not of the world. The invisible soul is shut up in the visible body; and so men know Christians as inhabitants of the world, but their life is hid with Christ in God. The flesh hates and fights the soul, though the soul does no injury to the flesh, but only prevents its giving itself up to its lusts; so also the world hates Christians; they do it no harm, but only set themselves against its lusts. The soul loves its hating flesh, and so Christians love those by whom they are hated. The soul is shut up in the body, and yet it is that by which the body is held together, and Christians are held to their post in the world, and it is they who hold the world together. The immortal soul dwells in the mortal body, and Christians

* Neander, K. G. I. 92.

dwell as strangers in the corruptible world, and await the unchangeable life in heaven. So important a part has God entrusted to them, which they dare not forsake."

In the year 251, a destructive pestilence visited the Roman empire, and was especially severe in northern Africa. The pagans at Carthage, through fear of infection, neglected the care of the sick; they even expelled them from their houses, and they died by heaps in the streets, and their dead bodies poisoned the air. Just before this the Christians had suffered a bloody persecution, and during the plague they were exposed to the fury of the populace, as if it were they who had drawn down the anger of the gods. Cyprian the bishop exhorted his congregation in this extremity to return good for evil. "If (said he) we do good to our brethren only, we do no more than publicans and pagans. As true Christians we must overcome evil with good; we must love our enemies as our Lord hath warned us, and pray for our persecutors. Since we are born of God, we must show ourselves worthy of our heavenly birth by imitating the goodness of our gracious Father." The congregation were not slow to follow the counsels of their bishop. The rich gave money and the poor their personal services; and soon the sick were nursed and the dead buried. (Neander, Denkw. I. 342, 3.)

At every meeting Christians offered fervent prayers that the unconverted pagans might be brought to participate in the happiness which true religion gives; and they contributed liberally for the support of the pagan poor.

By such principles and conduct they at length lived down the slanders so industriously propagated against them, that they were the enemies of their fellow-men; and their influence was like the leaven which gradually and silently changes the whole surrounding mass to its own substance.

II. What were the feelings and conduct of these Christians—

1. In the church?

The church was with them a scene of brotherly love, of spiritual edification, of deep devotion. The first business of their meetings was an interchange of the most affecting demonstrations of mutual love. The reading of the word of God, singing hymns of praise, and uttering fervent prayers, made up the usual routine of exercises. These were not empty forms. They were gushings of full and warm

hearts ; the acts of worshippers who felt their God to be a Spirit, that must be worshipped in spirit and in truth.

Pliny, a heathen magistrate and a persecutor, after a laborious and minute investigation by order of the emperor, in the course of which he had put two female Christians to the torture to extort from them a full confession, gives the following account of their meetings. (Epist. x. 91.) "They are accustomed to meet on a certain day early, before it is light, and sing a hymn to Christ as God ; they bind themselves by oath to abstain from every thing vicious, as theft, robbery, adultery, deception, dishonesty, etc. They separate and come together again to a common meal ; and there is nothing blameworthy among them, except that they persevered in their meetings after the magistrates had prohibited them."

Justin Martyr gives the following more particular description. (Apol. 22, 98.) "When we meet we sing praise to the Creator of the universe through his Son Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost. On Sunday we all assemble in one place, both those who live in the city and they who dwell in the country, and the writings of the Apostles and Prophets are read so long as the time permits. When the reader stops, the president of the meeting makes an address, in which he instructs the people and exhorts them to follow the glorious things which they have heard read from the Scriptures. Then we all stand up together and pray. After prayer, bread, wine, and water are brought in. The president of the meeting again prays according to his ability, and gives thanks, to which the people respond Amen. After this the bread, wine, and water are distributed to those present ; and the deacons carry portions to such as are necessarily detained from the meeting. Those who are able and willing, contribute what they please in money, which is given to the president of the meeting ; and it is appropriated to the support of widows and orphans, the sick, the poor, and whomever is necessitous."

The following is the account of Tertullian. (Apol. c. 39.) "We are accustomed to assemble, that we may with our united strength move God by our prayers. We come together also to hear the holy Scriptures read, to receive exhortations according to circumstances, and to learn. We nourish our piety with the words of holy Writ, we encourage

each other in hope, we plant unwavering faith, and teach the people godly discipline and a good life. We there also have warnings, reproofs, and such discipline as God ordains." They met always on Sundays, generally also on Saturdays, and frequently on Wednesdays and Fridays. Of the nature of their devotions the following account is given by Cyprian. "When we pray, our whole heart must be intent on our prayer. Our heart must be shut to the adversary and open only to God; for the adversary will often creep in and strive, by his deceptions, to turn our prayer away from God, so that we may have one thing in our mouth and another in our heart. But we must with upright purpose pray to the Lord, not with the sound of our voice merely, but with our soul and our sense. Christ teaches us to say *our* Father, not *my* Father. Our prayer must be comprehensive. We pray not for individuals only, but for the whole church, since we, being one church, are all but one body. God wills that each one should pray for all, as he, being one, bore the sins of all." (Compare Arnold's K. § I.)

2. In the business of life.

As we have already seen, Christians mingled in the ordinary business of life; they were engaged in the various occupations and trades of the people around them; and in all the forms of business they were intimately associated with their heathen neighbors. But they were careful, not only to preserve a scrupulous honesty in all their dealings, they would immediately abandon trade or profession, however lucrative it might be, or however necessary to the support of their families, if it were seen that the occupation was in any respect an immoral one, or that it encouraged their heathen neighbors in the practice of sin, or was in any way inconsistent with the precepts of Christianity. In an age when all the forms and business of society were so closely connected with pagan idolatry, when so many arts and trades centered in the idol worship, and lived on the vices of men, vast multitudes of Christians must have been thrown out of employment and reduced to extreme poverty, by the conscientious abandonment of trades, the only ones which they could practise, and on which their livelihood depended. They must find some other mode of living, or consent even to pauperism, rather than violate the precepts of the religion they professed. The church undertook the support of such

men and their families, rather than let them continue in a doubtful calling; and they were willing to be poor and live like paupers, rather than neglect the slightest admonitions of conscience. On this point Tertullian gives ample directions.* If those are converted who were makers of idols, they must pursue some other branch of their trade, repair houses, plaster walls, line cisterns, coat columns. He who can carve a Mercury can put together a chest of drawers; there are few temples to be built, but many houses; few Mercuries to be gilded, but many sandals and slippers. If schoolmasters, they must even relinquish their calling rather than teach the adventures of the heathen gods, consecrate the first payment of each scholar to Minerva, or keep holidays in honor of Flora. If cattle merchants, they are to buy for the shambles but not for the altar. If hucksters, they are at least not to deal in incense.

In an African church a stage actor was converted to Christianity, and having no other means of living, he instructed boys for the stage. Cyprian (Epist. 61,) wrote that this must not be tolerated. "If he is poor and needy, let him come among the rest who are supported by the church, and let him be content with a poorer and more innocent maintenance. But he must not imagine that he deserves wages for ceasing from sin, for in this he is doing service not to us but to himself. Seek, then, by all means in your power, to turn him from this bad and disgraceful life, to the way of innocence and hope of eternal life; and that he be content with a more sparing, but yet a more wholesome diet, which the church will provide for him. And if your church is not able to do this, send him to us, and we will provide him with necessary food and clothing; that he may not teach others who are out of the church destructive things, but may himself within the church learn the things which pertain to salvation."

3. In the intercourse and recreations of society.

All dissipating amusements were strictly prohibited, and the Christian was exhorted on all occasions to demean himself with a gravity and sobriety becoming a soldier of Jesus Christ and a priest of the most high God. From most of the

* See review of Milman's Gibbon in the London Quarterly for October, 1838.

amusements of their heathen neighbors they conscientiously abstained; and the weak and the vain who suffered themselves to be betrayed into them, were promptly and severely rebuked.

"The Christian lady (says Tertullian, de Cult. II. 11,) visits not the heathen plays, and the noisy amusements of their feast days, but she goes out to visit the sick, to partake of the sacrament, or to hear the word of God."

It seems that some weaker brethren and sisters could scarcely relinquish the amusements and gratifications to which they had been accustomed in early life, and endeavored to justify themselves, as Christians now do who are fond of the same irregularities. They said that the gifts of God were good and might be used for our lawful pleasure, that plays and dances were nowhere expressly forbidden in Scripture, that it was right to dance, for David danced before the ark; that it could not be wrong to visit chariot races and horse races, for Elijah went to heaven in a chariot and with horses of fire, and the apostle Paul drew many of his illustrations from the race-course and the circus.

Respecting such subterfuges, Tertullian exclaims; "O how wise does human folly deem itself in arguing, especially when it fears to love some worldly pleasure. Every thing is indeed the gift of God, but we must consider to what end the things of God are given, and use them in accordance with their original design, or we commit sin. True, we nowhere find in Scripture an express verbal prohibition of theatres and plays; but we find there the general principles of which this prohibition is the necessary consequence."

In respect to the argument from Paul's illustrations, he remarks: "It were better that they had never known the Scriptures than to pervert, to the defence of vice, those words and examples which were given to excite us to evangelical virtue; for these things are written to raise our zeal the higher for useful things, since the heathen manifest so great zeal for things of no use. Tell me, what should be our desire, other than that of the apostle, to depart and be with Christ? There is thy joy whither thy desire tends. Art thou so ungrateful as to overlook or be dissatisfied with the many and great joys which the Lord hath already given thee? For what is more joyful than reconciliation with God,

thy Father and Lord, than the revelation of the truth, the escaping from error, the forgiveness of so many sins? What greater joy than the declining of the vain joys of the world, than the true freedom, the pure conscience, the innocent life, the fearlessness of death? * * * These are the amusements, these are the plays of the Christian, which men cannot pay for with money, And what kind of joy is that which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived"? (Neander K. § I. 447—50.)

Whatever unfitted their minds for devotion to God, and an effective counteraction of the wickedness of the world, was avoided as inconsistent with their religious profession. Still they were cheerful, courteous, and companionable in all the usual intercourse of society. "We are no Brahmins, (says Tertullian, Apol. c. 42), we are no Hindoo Fakiers, we are not eremites or hermits, who flee from life. We are well aware of the obligations we owe to God, our Creator and Lord. We reject the enjoyment of none of his gifts; we seek only to preserve the requisite moderation, and to avoid abuses. We do not live in this world without participating in your markets, your baths, your public houses, your work-shops, your auctions, and every thing which pertains to the commerce of life. We engage with you in navigation, in military service, in agriculture, in trade. We engage with you in manufactures, and devote our labor to your benefit."

4. In their families.

The Christians were not a gloomy or morose set of men. In their families the spirit of kindness, love, and cheerfulness were everywhere conspicuous. Purity, peace and joy were the constant inmates of their households; and not only the natural members of the family, but every Christian, from whatever land or clime, was freely admitted to all its simple delights.

The following picture of a Christian family is given by Tertullian, (ad Uxor. II. 8.) "What a union is that between two believers! They have one hope and one desire; they serve one faith and one Master. Theirs is a union of the spirit as well as of the flesh—one spirit and one flesh. They read the Scriptures together, they pray together, they fast together, they teach, warn, bear one another's burdens. They are together at the church, and at

the Lord's table, they share together afflictions, persecutions, and joys. Neither conceals any thing from the other, neither avoids the other, neither is burdensome to the other. Freely the sick can be relieved, and alms distributed to the poor. They sing their psalms and hymns together, and emulate each other in sounding the praises of their God. Jesus Christ is pleased when he sees and hears such things as these; to them he gives his peace. Where two are in his name, there is he also, and where he is the wicked one cometh not."

Such a scene of quiet domestic enjoyment was unknown to the pagan world; it is the legitimate offspring of Christianity, and it strikes the unchristian world with surprise.

The following description of Christian intercourse in their love-feasts is also by Tertullian, (Apol. 39.) "They sit not down at table till prayers have been offered to God. They eat as much as the hunger of each one requires, and drink only so much as is necessary to health and cheerfulness. Being thus satisfied, they are mindful that the evening is to be spent in prayer. They enter into conversation with the continued reflection that God is hearing them. After their hands are washed and lights are brought in, each one is invited to sing something before the company to the praise of God, whether it be borrowed from the holy Scripture, or as his own heart may dictate to him. Then it is seen how much he has drunken. With prayer the interview is closed."

Such families were too happy in their own quiet homes to need or desire the noisy amusements of a restless world. The children found their happiness in the parents, and the parents in the children, and both in God. Such families were the nurseries of pure, consistent and efficient churches, and such churches were the lights of the world, which could not be hid, the salt of the earth, which never lost its savor.

Indeed, so simple-hearted, so pure-minded, so unaffectedly sincere were they in all their conduct, that they thereby won over multitudes even of unbelievers and atheists, and those who had the most violent prejudices of early education and constant habit against them and their doctrines; in like manner as since, hypocrites and half Christians, by their affectation of religion in profession and violation of it in practice, have given false impressions of Christianity, and made

unbelievers and atheists and scoffers of those who in early life had been educated to believe and reverence the Bible.

Such is an imperfect but faithful sketch of what Christians were doing the century and a half which immediately preceded the reign of Constantine. Is it any wonder that such Christians maintained their ground, and made progress in spite of the most terrible opposition, and in an age of the most gigantic corruption and wickedness? The silent power of a holy life is irresistible, and more terrible than an army with banners to all the hosts of Satan; but the devil, and all unbelievers, laugh in perfect security when Christians endeavor to hold their ground, and make their way by hoarse controversy and fierce denunciation, while they live so much like the world around them, that the Christian cannot be recognised except at the communion table. I have purposely omitted allusion to the bitter and terrific persecutions which they endured from the civil power, and their constancy and fidelity under them; because I would confine the attention to those points in which their circumstances resembled ours, and where we can have no excuse for not practising the same virtues, and to the same extent, that they did.

Some may here be disposed to inquire, "Had these Christians no faults? We have heard much of their imperfections, of their errors, of their imperfect morality." It is true that they had faults, many and great faults. Just emerging as they did from all the loathsome pollutions of heathenism, their views on many points of morals were imperfect, and their perceptions of moral truth were far from being clear. But whatever their faults were, they had no hypocrisy in their *religious professions*. In these they were altogether whole-hearted and sincere, and they performed their duty so far as they knew it. They were ready at any time to sacrifice their all for Christ; and when they said that they gave up themselves and all that they had to be the Lord's, they meant just what they said, and shrunk not from any of the responsibilities involved in such a profession. It was their simple, implicit, whole-hearted faith which gave them their mighty power, and decked them in panoply for their terrific conflict with the powers of darkness, and gave them at last the victory. It is true, they were roughly accoutred and imperfectly disciplined, but with the whole soul they

loved the cause in which they were engaged; and in comparison with the better instructed Christians of modern times, they were like the bare-footed and ill-armed continentals of our revolutionary struggle, who loved their country, and were ready to die for it, in comparison with the well-equipped and disciplined troops that were brought against them, who had no country to love, and whose chief motive of action was a determination to maintain an honorable and soldier-like reputation. We all know which of the two succeeded the best.

Let us conscientiously make the comparison, and judge whether the church now is characterized generally by the essential features of a sincere profession as strongly as it was then. Is there as much of deep and profoundly reverential feeling in regard to God and his word, and the same habits of devotional communion with him? Is there an equal self-respect and regard for consistency in those who profess to be the soldiers of Jesus Christ, and the high priests of God in this polluted world? Is there the same ardent love and community of feeling among Christian brethren, which makes every requisite allowance for human infirmity, and avails itself to the utmost of every existing excellence for the common good? Is there the same pious, tender, conscientious concern for the spiritual interests of an unconverted world, which beholds even in the most provoking scoffer and persecutor, a soul for which Jesus died, and which is capable of being made an heir of eternal glory? Is there the same quiet, devotional, happy, receptive, melting spirit in the meetings of the church, which feeds with delight on the milk of the word, and joins, with a soul filled to overflowing, in the exercises of prayer and praise? Is there the same conscientious regard to Christian duty in the common pursuits and business of life, which makes a man willing to relinquish any traffic, however lucrative, any profession, however gainful, which has one stain of pollution in it, so as actually to reduce himself to poverty, rather than do any thing inconsistent with the highest exercise of supreme love to God and benevolent affection to man? Is there the same avoiding for themselves and their children of the noisy and dissipating amusements of an irreligious world? Is there the same disregard of the fashions of the world? Is there the same quiet, peaceful, holy temper in the family circle?

Are these the general, prevailing characteristics of professors of religion in our times, so that wherever we see a professor of religion, we expect to see such a character as this? If not, then, with all the improvements and advantages of modern times, we have yet something to learn from the *piety of the early Christians.*

ARTICLE VI.

ON THE HUSKS THAT THE SWINE DID EAT.

By Rev. Samuel H. Cox, D. D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.

And he would fain have filled his belly with the husks that the swine did eat: and no man gave unto him.—Luke 15 : 16.

MY attention has been lately turned to the meaning of the word *husks*, in this passage, a specimen of which I have just received from the Mediterranean. Indebted to a respected member of my church for the present, I have no doubt of its genuineness. His ships traverse many distant seas; and by a recent arrival from the Levant, he received the same from the Rev. Mr. Dwight, missionary, at Smyrna. The interest thus awakened, has induced me to communicate the results of some attention bestowed on the subject.

Καὶ ἐπεθύμει γεμίσαι τὴν κοιλίαν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν κερατίων ὧν ἤσθιον οἱ χοῖροι καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδίδου αὐτῷ.

Thus reads the original. We inquire mainly, what means the word *husks?* What were they, credibly, which are thus represented as moving the appetite, even of a starving man, to devour them, and that to satiety; being "filled" with them?

In America, where the aboriginal Indian corn, or maize, has in effect monopolized the application of the word *corn*, we are coming almost universally to understand by it, maize alone. Whereas, in all the English world besides, and in our common English Bible, the word *corn* is a generic or collective term, for all farinaceous grains or substances, previously to the process of grinding, which reduces them to

the consistency of meal, flour, or bran. Thus wheat, rye, oats, buckwheat, and other staples of agriculture, are denominated corn; not with us in the United States, but with the whole English world besides us; as when they speak of corn crops, corn stuffs, and corn laws, or the like. With us, by corn is meant, simply, maize; and by an allied usage, the word *husks* becomes appropriated to the exterior rind, bark, hull, or integument, that immediately covers and protects the seeds or grains.

The consequence is that among the common people—we do not, of course, implicate the clergy, or the learned of other classes, in the statement—the impressions produced, by reading the passage in question, are ludicrous, or absurd and incredible. This is so, we apprehend, in the experience of almost all youthful readers among us. The figure, in the mind's eye, is that of a famished man, desiring to eat corn-stalks, or the dry husks of hard Indian corn; and to that end, almost grudging the luxury, to the miserable, and to the Jews especially, the execrable, quadrupeds, which it was then his deep degradation to attend. Nor is the riddle improved, when we imagine that even swine should think it luxury, or use such aliment. They will eat our corn, but are not ordinarily reduced to any monstrous necessity of subsisting—if this were possible—on husks!

Mistakes of this sort too afford materials, comparatively among the best, for the day-dreams of modern infidelity. A plausibly deduced absurdity is the occasion of arraigning or denouncing the inspiration of the holy Scriptures. How could a man eat husks or corn-stalks? How could swine? Thus, by weapons as contemptible or as silly, is the bosom of the hearer pierced, and poisoned against the truth.

The specimen mentioned above, is a perfect illustration of the sense of Scripture, and as good a vindication of its truth from such or similar attacks. The word *κεράτιον* occurs in no other passage of the New Testament. It refers doubtless to the very species now identified in the specimen—as we gather from an induction of many particulars. It is a dark hard pod or capsule, about three inches in length, with seeds (8 or 10) that rattle in the case, gently, when shaken, and with a noise resembling that of a rattle-snake. Each seed is about the size of an ordinary dry pea, not perfectly round, but flattened; hard, and of a dark red-

dish color. The taste of the pod is poor, but not entirely disagreeable; being sweetish, somewhat nutritious even in its dry state, and probably much more palatable and proper for food in its earlier or green state. The whole form is slightly curved, resembling a small horn; from which in Greek its name seems to be derived; *ἀ κερας*, cornu. The whole form or show of them on the tree, especially at some seasons of the year, would better suggest probably the idea of horns, as if the tree was full of them.

Such facts are not too trivial to be useful; and their relation of propriety to a REPOSITORY, mainly BIBLICAL, will be obvious to all. They assist our understanding of the parable of the *Prodigal Son*, and may aid our wisdom in looking through its drapery to the great idea it there inculcates—that worldlings, going away from God for happiness, are compelled often to covet the most miserable substitutes—to subsist on elements, that show their degradation, and make even brutes, in their proper spheres, appear their enviable superiors.

A few authorities, and I have done.

Dr. Campbell translates the word without change, *husks*. His note on the passage however is valuable.

With the husks, απο των κερατιων. Vul. *De Siliquis.* That *κερατιον* answers to *siliqua*, and signifies *a husk*, or pod, wherein the seeds of some plants, especially those of the leguminous tribe, are contained, is evident, But both the Greek *κερατιον* and the Latin *siliqua*, signify also the fruit of the carob-tree, a tree very common in the Levant, and in the southern parts of Europe, as Spain and Italy. The Syriac and Arabic words are of the same import. This fruit still continues to be used for the same purposes, the feeding of swine. It is also called *St. John's Bread*, from the opinion that the Baptist used it in the wilderness. It is the pod only that is eaten, which shows the propriety of the names *κερατιον* and *siliqua*, and of rendering it into English *husk*. Miller says, it is mealy, and has a sweetish taste, and that it is eaten by the poorer sort; for it grows in the common hedges, and is of little account.

Our specimen perfectly verifies the above description. We must however dissent from the sentiment that *husks* is the proper or eligible way of rendering it into English. It strikes us as far preferable to substitute the word *pods*.

This would be intelligible, and comparatively inaccessible to the evils of mistake or perversion ; as it seems almost the precise counterpart of the original, or comparatively the proper word.

Doddridge is more conjectural and less satisfactory. He says, "I take it, on the whole, to have been *the fruit of a tree*, something of a *wild chestnut* kind." He refers to Brown, Saubert, Grotius, Drusius, *in loco*, and others.

From Robinson's Calmet, waiting for his better or more authentic and forth coming publication, as our grand thesaurus of biblical antiquities, we transcribe the following:

"Most interpreters are of opinion that the Greek word signifies *carob-beans*, the fruit of a tree of the same name ; *Ceratonia Siliquæ* of Linnæus. There was a sort of wine or liquor, much used in Syria, drawn from it, and the lees of it were given to the hogs. The Greeks and Latins both name carob-beans *ceratia ;* and Pliny, as well as the Vulgate, calls them *Siliquæ*. This fruit is common in Palestine, Greece, Italy, Provence and Barbary. It is suffered to ripen and grow dry on the tree. The poor eat it, and the cattle are fattened with it. The tree is of a middle size, full of branches, and abounding with round leaves an inch or two in diameter. The blossoms are little red clusters, with abundance of yellowish stalks. The fruits are flat pods, from half a foot to fourteen inches long,* and an inch and a half broad. They are brown at the top, sometimes crooked, composed of two husks, separated by membranes into several cells, and containing flat, shining seeds, something like those of cassia. The substance of these husks is filled with a sweetish, honey-like kind of juice, not unlike that of the pith of cassia. In all probability, its crooked figure occasioned its being called, in Greek, *Keratia*, which signifies *little horns*."

---

* Our specimen is small in the comparison—and yet verified.

ARTICLE VII.

The Influence of the Age upon Poetry, and of Poetry upon the Age.

By Grenville Mellen, New-York.

Did we consider it necessary, at this time, to give authority for admiration of the great and gifted in song, we should refer ourselves at once to the tribute which has been paid to poetic genius from the earliest times to our own. The high rank held by poets, in almost every country, during the infancy of its civilization, or of its letters, has been retained, with those modifications, certainly, which might be expected in the progress of society, so that we find it essentially unchanged and undisputed even among ourselves. The ancient superstition which invested the bard with a character of divinity, and his song with all the authority and sacredness of the oracles, naturally resulted from the frequent exhibition of lofty and enthusiastic spirits, in powerful struggle with their strong conceptions, before a people comparatively simple and uncultivated. It is not astonishing that the flight of birds, the responses of the Sybil, or even the "*intonuit lævum*"—the propitiatory thunders of Jove—should be deemed less infallible tokens of a present inspiration, than the kindling strains of the poet, when he appealed, in glowing numbers, to the feelings or the patriotism of his auditory: or when he sung of deeds that touched their memories with an electric interest; or, more than all, when he bore them with him into the shadowy future, and there unveiled visions of glory and greatness, which, by the contrivance of his wizard power were transformed from the mere pageantry of imagination into splendid realities. It is matter familiar with our classic associations, that bards, as well as conquerors, were followed, and courted, and crowned; and it is not an easy thing to decide whether Æschylus was less honored than Miltiades; or whether he might not have borne additional renown from Marathon, while he was gazed on as the father of tragedy.

Indeed the classical ovations which were awarded to successful poets, sink the triumphs of kings and consuls to the level of common spectacles. There was every thing intellectual in those early tributes to mental power returned from mental victory. There is an ever-during recollection that attaches itself to honors so won and so rendered. Considered as offerings to genius, they reflect glory alike on those who brought and those who received them. A dawn of moral light seems to be coincident with the morning of social life which such homage serves to indicate; and, though the tribute be purely mental, there comes with it a hope that the heart may awaken to truth, where there is such a stirring and pressing towards the shrine of mind. Certain it is that such exertions of powerful men, demanding such honors as they proceeded, were the first causes as well as the first proofs of improvement among the people from whom they stood distinguished: and it is to the poets of Greece and Italy, triumphing in laurel-wreath or the plaudits of their countrymen, that we are to look, we had almost said, as the solitary men who first kindled that spark, which eventually caused an illumination of their age, and has continued to transmit its light to the world.

The influence of poetry, in the hands of the masters of antiquity, was carried to an extent that may seem almost incredible. They may be said to have formed and trained the virtues of those who heard them. They shaped the national sentiment, they moulded the opinions and wielded the sympathies of their listeners, to a degree that cannot be surpassed. They interwove public events with the drama. They excited an ambition to excel in wisdom and valor; and, by force of genius and skill, they generated among the aspiring and young the sentiments of glory that fell from the lips of their heroes. Euripides was the idol of his time. By promoting a more effectual union than had yet subsisted between moral philosophy and tragic representation, he became an object of praise and admiration with his contemporaries. His verses were on the lips of all who answered to the name of Greek. History tells us, with an air of romance, that the fortunate introduction of some of his stanzas released the soldiers of Nicias from the slavery which they incurred in the expedition of that general to Syracuse; and, as if to carry the magic of his name beyond all rivalry, it has been

pleasantly said, that of old the prisoner always found freedom by drafting his plea in the language of Euripides.

Surpassing, as these instances would almost seem to do, the fabled enchantment of Orpheus, we are not left to them and like ancient sources, alone, for proof of the high distinction ever held by the poet and his art. The golden age of every country, since the revival of letters, has been signalized by the light that poetry has shed upon it, and by the honors rendered to the inspired men who may be regarded as its stars. Italy, Spain, France, England, as the new morning of mind dawned upon them, successively beheld their mighty geniuses springing upon their paths, with a power which they delighted to reverence, and a brilliancy that could not fail to captivate. In all these lands, the history of literature proves decidedly the talent which this class of men possessed of infusing their own into the public sentiment, as well as of fixing the public eye on themselves; while it is enough, too, to convince us that they held important place on the scale of society, formed as they were to exert an influence on the growing character of their country.

But, while we perceive a singular power to have been sustained by the poets of high accomplishment in all ages, it is evident that in modern times the same power is either greatly modified, or holds a more quiet sway over the minds of the people. The principle of the power is the same. It is the power of an ardent, bold, creative nature, over spirits that cannot follow its march, but still bow to the dominion which has attended it. It is the power of a high-reaching, imaginative intellect over a passive one, yielded to the beautiful illusion which is thrown around it. It is the power of genius—penetrating to that subtle portion of the soul, which alone can claim sympathy, how remote soever it may be, with the master spirit which spells it—breathing upon it the breath of a new life, and calling it to the love of high deeds and splendid virtues, of which it had before but dull conception, or drowsy remembrance. Such is the power of poetry. Such is the gift of the poet; and to such power and such gifts has the world ever paid its admiration, where there have been poets to sing, or men to listen.

In the progress of things, the unity of this power has passed gradually away. Its distinctiveness has been lost in

the crowding interests of life; but its agency, though more secret and diffused, is still felt, with a vigor, indestructible as ever, and, when we consider the vast sphere in which it is called to operate, almost as wonderful. In the simplicity of the early, and the comparatively moral inaction of the middle ages, it was a necessary consequence of the state of the times, that the poet should hold a more discernible elevation, that the exercise of his power should be more direct, and consequently more effectual, upon the mass of mankind. As society advanced, he also, as the depositary of this power, lost his original superiority amongst men. They turned from *him*, to the sublime and elevating things which he had eloquently revealed, no longer to dream over, but to study, and pant after, and pursue them; until, by a gradation, the most natural in the world, the poet descended to diffuse among his fellows those beautiful and kindly influences, that, in older times, he had dispensed as favors from a superior to his followers. Then, you may say, poetry was leagued with superstitious dread. Now, it goes hand in hand with the charities of life. It was then a thing to wonder and tremble at—heard, in terrible distinctness, as a revelation, amid the forests and sacred groves of the gods. Now, it makes part of the music of the world. It enters into our dwellings and our hearts. It mingles with our social duties, and ennobles —purifies—endears our spirits and our memories. Then, the poet was honored, as almost a deity, and his numbers listened to as the breathings of prophecy, or with the chastened delight of hearts bowed continually to threatening and commanding genius. Now, he is honored, where he should be, as a man; and his works come abroad to animate us to our duties, or to cheer us in solitude—to charm us by their power, or to woo us by their beauty. Then, he was like a monarch on his throne, lording it over the kingdom of unawakened intellect. Now, he is but a gifted brother of the great family, bearing indeed the same brow of inspiration, the same wand of genius; but he mingles with the busy throng, and, with his harp upon his shoulder, scatters his music to his fellows, as he passes onward in the common pilgrimage.

So, too, as the mode in which the poetic influence was accustomed to operate, has changed with the changes of time and things, has the popularity of the poet found new sources

in the altered inclinations and feelings of his readers. Hence no modern writer may be said to bear at once and incontestably the palm of superiority, or is, like one of the ancient masters, placed, as if by acclamation, upon the pinnacle of poetic renown. Though his genius may entitle him to high rank, yet the conflicting struggles of aspirants round him, and the collisions of differing tastes and favoritisms, render his right for a season questionable, and his fame less brilliant. This is a natural consequence, where there are so many to share in the splendid rivalry.

Schools of poetry we have heard talked of, till their names, in some instances, have come to be familiar words. And these schools have actually engendered a party spirit in poetry—so that we find something like *clanism* meeting us even on the pathway of Parnassus. If Wordsworth, and Leigh Hunt, and Coleridge may be said to constitute the head of the Lake School, Pope was as certainly the head of the philosophical or metaphysical. We know not, that Byron, in short, has been unaptly termed the leader of the demoniac order. Certain it is, that each of these writers is distinguished by something peculiar to himself—and each one has his partisans. We know not, again, that this can be helped; nor, on the whole, that it is a fair subject of complaint. As a general rule, every man has a right to his taste, and a consequent privilege of praising him who best suits it. Still there is something to be regretted even in this. There is, after all, hardly as much latitude allowable in relation to governing principles, in the republic of letters, as in the body politic. It is more desirable to have such things as style and taste fixed, and amenable to a standard, than it is to have faith in matters of government squared by any particular creed. With regard to poetical *schools*, this evil of partisanship—a partisanship which has been carried to labored articles, and even to the enlistment of journals in favor of their different leaders, is decidedly destructive. It has made—it still makes, *mannerists* of writers, and, as far as this goes, it is particularly fatal to the fine spirit of poetry.

It has been said, as though by way of excuse for its most unpardonable irregularities, that genius always has its characteristics. It may be so; but they are always essentially the same, where high and holy enthusiasm animates the votary. As to poetry, we believe that the glorious art receives

no additional dignity, either from the noisy blazonry of the merits of some who profess it, and whose claim to *genius* consists only in their peculiarities, or from consenting to submit itself to any of the working-day methods of gaining popularity. It strikes us, that far from conforming itself to the demands of a diseased taste, or the unhealthy fancies of society, poetry has but one eminent object before it—to make men better by the spirit which it breathes around them. We believe that mere trickery of phrase, gilded imagery, and prettinesses of thought, constitute no vital portion of poetry; and we are unwilling to think that that verse is destined to live, which, at best, is a mere attempt at originality, or a mass of labored simplicity, in the worst signification of the word. We wish to see that kind of metrical composition alone recognised as poetry, which is such in the true sense of the term; made such by the combination of great thought with harmony of numbers, and whose music derives its greatest attractiveness from the sentiment. This we hold to be the true criterion; and, by this standard, we should point to him as the true Roscius of his art, who, in the best strains, best sings the deathless charms of virtue and honor; who stamps, in golden lines, upon his age, those sublime lessons of moral power, that of old sometimes lured the great to glory and the good to heaven; who comes upon the world in the swift coinage of thoughts that shall die only with time, because they bear about them and in them the vitality of truth. High place, it is true, has been attained by intellectual energy, where the moral principle had no visible ascendency in the individual. But it is false and inconclusive logic, to argue from the height that has been reached by certain powers, the impossibility of reaching one still higher, by the help of additional ones. The true reasoning is the reverse. Shakspeare is an exception to the remark that will apply here. Though of a spirit, certainly, that made no pretension to unction, still the wonderful lessons which his poetry embalms come home to our sympathies and our consciences with the effect of so many saintly homilies. His truths search us like sermons teeming with holiness. But Shakspeare is an anomaly. Who can speak in this strain of Burns or Byron? And yet who does not see what mighty things, above all that either has effected for the world, would have been accomplished by Burns and Byron, had the moral

taken precedence of the intellectual principle in their poetry? No one can deny, that, with the same mental energy at work, and under the precedence referred to, there certainly would have been nothing to diminish it. In both cases the poet would have been so much greater as the man had been better. The triumph had been contemporaneous and parallel. But we pass to another consideration.

Under the direction of a good taste, simplicity is undoubtedly a virtue of good poetry. But we hold it not to be the cardinal one to which some would elevate it. As an ingredient it has its value; but when the higher properties of the composition are made subservient to it, there is great danger of failure. Manliness and power should never wait upon simplicity. As it is, indeed, it is a fault, and a childish one, we conceive, among some of the poetic brotherhood on this side the water. Cowper, on the other, may be said to have set the example of the plain, domestic poetry of modern days. But since his time, the mania, that in him was delightful, has spread, gathering sad symptoms, until it has passed from the character of simple-hearted to that of simple-headed; until, indeed, it has degenerated, in some instances, from pure simplicity, to something worse than weakness—to folly, and almost to grossness. Now this is the joint effect of a proneness to imitate English standards—of a mistaken notion in the writers themselves, and of public opinion—that is, so far as criticism may be said to express it. This inclination to imitate is so evident, we believe, with a great portion of our native writers, that we think it would be idle to go gravely to work to prove it. We mean to be understood that the imitation of which we here speak, has been of what will one day be decried—if they are not already—as the very worst faults of the originals. Of high and commanding models we cannot have too much imitation, if that may be called such which is but a sympathetic expression of strong mind in strong language. In the great features of power, all great writers will have a resemblance—and, so far as this is concerned, it is no imitation. It is coincidence.

In some instances among ourselves, our bards have mistaken the spirit of simplicity altogether; or, if they have not mistaken it, they have, like some of their prototypes, suffered themselves to commit divers poetical felonies, under the name. We too frequently meet extreme quaintness, or a

train of thought teeming with improbable devices, or bad conclusions. But the writer tells us this is simplicity. Again, we are struck with the degree of quietness that marks his style—perchance it may be sleepiness; there seems to be a continual aim at suppression of thought, as though it were unrefined to give it play—as some men hold it so, to be natural and hearty in society. But the author tells us again, this is simplicity. Once more, we fall in company with one who travels perpetually in a mist; who loses himself and his readers in his own metaphysical labyrinth; who torments us with a display of what Mr. Pollock calls merely the "tops of thoughts." And here our only consolation is that every thing about us is simplicity.

Genuine simplicity is not that of a person striving to be simple. It is not the simplicity of a heart unacquainted with the world and its trials. It is the expressive singleness of a mind accustomed to linger with the grandeur and power of the natural and intellectual worlds, and using its experience of the sorrows that lie beneath them, to regulate its emotions, or to "point the moral" it would enforce. To this delicate endowment one great charm of good poetry must be attributed—always and everywhere. It influences, not only in the choice of thought, but in the choice of language, in the happy perception of which, as appropriate to sentiment, we may observe, lies the grand secret of much—very much—that is graceful and admirable in poetry. It is a commanding quality; and, we apprehend, not fully appreciated. It is the only redeeming quality of that work which is exceptionable in its spirit, and the beauty and enchantment of that which is honorable to the artist. It is next to genius, and, on every occasion, its most effective minister. In short, it is in composition, what conscience is in morals—keeping the writer ever within the bounds of propriety, or at least of good taste; and operating as a continual rebuke, whenever he is inclined to swerve from purity and harmony of expression.

A more material change has not accompanied human improvement, than that which literature has undergone from one period to another; and in no one department of literature has it been more striking or effectual than in poetry—the poetry of our own day. View writing at large, and instead of the mystical and labored style that ran through the best pro-

ductions of earlier times, and which, moreover, was so accordant with the comparative seclusion and silence of letters, we now hear both the philosopher and the elegant scholar delivering themselves with that free and graceful expression which so well comports with the liberal character of the age; while as to poetry, a popular air has been breathed into the best works of the best writers, imparting to them a freshness and meaning that come home with the attractiveness of domestic story to all who are capable of any intellectual delight. Poetry, we may be suffered to repeat it, has become a part of our lives. It has, in a sense, conformed itself to our conditions, and it speaks to us in the direct language of an acquaintance, who has been accustomed to unfold to us freely, at all times, and in all places. Divested of the heroics and the pomp with which it once awed and overshadowed the children of men, it now comes to us like a kind but superior spirit, enlivening, beguiling, instructing us, amidst the offices and sympathies of life. This is the true character of poetry. It is the character of the genuine poetry of the present day. Let us not be misunderstood. We would not qualify any of our preceding remarks. They refer to no such poetry as we refer to here—the poetry of the unchastened and fearless spirit—the poetry which stirs while it blesses us—the poetry that carries all its persuasiveness, without relinquishing any of its power. It may be said that we lay great stress upon this quality of strength. We do so; but not more than it deserves; and we do so because there is a disposition to make it a secondary affair in poetical composition. With those who hold this doctrine we utterly disagree; and whenever poetry departs from its primitive and natural dignity, to become the medium of ephemeral fancies, or the minister to a sickly taste, we hold that it has no longer a claim to the title. Genius disowns it for ever.

If it be true that public opinion may sometimes happily interfere to correct or modify the works of art, it is equally certain that its interference may go far, under some form or other, to injure or destroy them. There are traits of nature too closely allied to the most accomplished efforts of mind, ever to yield to the artificial requisitions of society. What would we think of the sculptor who should bring us forth a statue robed in the fashion of our drawing-rooms, and call

it the true Apollo—the very Belvidere? The truth is, these traits need never be, they never *must* be surrendered. There exists no necessity for their surrender, as there does in politics for the relinquishment of individual natural rights, for the good of the whole body. They are the holy things of nature—thrice holy in poetry—which, if once associated with what is uncongenial or irrelevant, lose their virtue and their beauty; and the work they were thought to adorn, is miserably and utterly destroyed.

We think it cannot have escaped even passing observation, that there is a class of people who profess to be great admirers of poetry, and many of whom assume to be its critical high priests and dissectors, who would set aside the hallowed inspiration of the poet, in favor of elaborateness or mere stratagems of style. With them, finish, polish, is every thing; and the greater the degree of attenuation the better. Now, did we believe that public sentiment on this subject was to be met by such a profanation of the high offices of poetry, we should say, indeed, that the sublime art was approaching a fearful crisis. But the hallelujahs of partisans do not constitute public sentiment. The reading public demands no such relinquishment; and the doctrines of those critics who would make poets so unfaithful to themselves and their divinity, by maintaining this system of poetical mechanics—by encouraging them in it, and praising them for it, under the grave sanction of a review, totally misrepresent the prevailing feeling of the community in this matter. Doubtless the spirit of poetry has been outraged by the very means which mistaken heads and unskilful hands have used, to give it a direction, and to propound to it rules and proprieties. Still we believe that this same spirit, though circulating among grosser materials, is yet virtually unsullied; that it still holds its wizzard power undisputed, though not untroubled. We have only to lament that in its nearer companionship with man, it has to endure the unsatisfying things which sometimes mark the propinquity. But we hope for a good issue—we believe in it. Better were it, indeed, that poetry, and the spirit of poetry, should pass from the world, than suffer the continued shame of such sacrifice as this to which we have alluded; and we would willingly forego, for ever, the delight of realizing it when in its purity, like some sweet friend, going abroad with us in our wanderings,

and again returning to make glad our hearts and hearths, rather than see it casting away its nobler properties, to conform itself to the childish and morbid tastes of those who cannot appreciate its hidden power, or its better attributes; who, calling themselves its judges, are nothing but its bane. Rather would we, than witness such abasement, be compelled to seek it in the blind old masters of antiquity—rather be driven back, to see it again, like jewels in a casket, locked in the shrine of the idolized men who ruled and rejoiced the simple but strong hearts of their hearers, in earlier, but in this respect, better times.

In leaving this part of our subject, we would observe, in reference to the spirit of criticism, that it is one of the strong enemies which poetry is doomed to encounter. The evil, too, of the sad condition of criticism, as connected with much of our literature, does not seem to be understood or appreciated. It leads to bad results, through its superficial and stereotyped character—bad both to the author, and to the journal which exhibits and encourages it. It is of miserable, sickly effect upon the author; because, in nine cases out of ten, being but an outside, unequal, unjust process of praise or execration, it begets in that author either ungraceful and ungodly vanity, or an undue, cruel, sinking mortification. Either of these consequences, where ill-feeling, ill-judgment, or bad taste bring them about, is of the worst kind, as opposed to all good exertion, in the good and wide cause of valuable literature. The evil is also of bad effect upon the journal which practises upon and spreads it; for it eventually exposes it to the charges of shallowness and partiality, while it renders its pages but a ridiculous exponent of our country's literature, with all minds at home and abroad, whose good opinion is its most valuable possession and support.

It is vain to think of a healthy literature, while we are under the ban of a sickly criticism. Worth, under this regimen, is rarely assigned its place in public opinion; while indifferent claims are too often allowed the force of the best, and he who presents them is put in the seat of honorable distinction, which talent and genius of nobler bearing ought alone to fill. True, it may be said that all this does not touch the vitality of the case. The scholar is no less a scholar that he is not within the ring of Mr. Oldbuck's Re-

view; nor is he made one by finding himself within the poor sunshine of a Quarterly. Still, omission of justice in one case, and the overdoing of it in the other, are matters which deserve our attention and reprobation, if for no other reason, simply because they render the name of our criticism a by-word, and a thing to be pointed at with detestation and scorn.

Such, we think, in too great a degree, is the *constitution* of our criticism. If this deserve support from a sensible and common sense people, we have no more to say. If, on the contrary, it deserve our reprobation and contempt, then we say, let it have them, in all we can do and say in connection with the good cause of a healthy literature, founded upon a true and healthy analysis of all that may fall within the grave shadow of its judgment. If we feel it to be a duty to advance *learning*, instead of the *man*, then let us favor that system which considers what he gives us, instead of, or at least *before*, himself. It is incumbent on us all to do justice, and to advocate it; and our best reward for this is, the undying reflection, that in giving such support, we did the best thing possible for Light and Truth. But we spoke, just now, of the spirit of criticism, as one of the strong enemies which poetry must encounter. In the same person the critical and poetical faculties are not only distinct, but they have no particular and observable sympathy. It would seem natural—indeed we hardly see how it could be otherwise—that the calm and continuous exercise of judgment, in the matter of the execution, should be incompatible with that excitement which the fervor of inspiration supposes; that the "thoughts that breathe and words that burn" will not wait upon any minister of language, whose business it is solely to square and guage, with an ever-accompanying readiness to be astonished at any disregard of the fixtures of style—those received manners of expression—which literal spirits regard as unalterable as a truth of mathematics. True poetry is too inartificial as well as too irrepressible, to suffer the peculiarities of its character to be lost in those of its guise. In the same individual, then, we repeat, the critical and poetical faculties are evidently distinct. So it is in literary collision—where one, as may be supposed in these days of writers and reviewers, is arrayed against the other; and we believe that

the unsatisfactory and dangerous business of verbal criticism has done more to make a mannerist of the poet, and to blast the natural and healthy purity of his verse, than all other things combined. It has compelled him to second thoughts. It has driven him to artifice. It has made him, what he ought never to be, a mere courtier in his art.

In another view of the subject, the poetic taste of our time has been, and still is, in many respects, essentially bad. It lingers with more complacency, upon the morbid and melancholy character of poetry, than upon its kindling and transcendent attributes. It has been taught that the sad complaining spirit of genius was the legitimate object of admiration, because it sang of afflictions that it could not designate, and of which it would have us believe it held solitary endurance. It has been told by the worshippers of diseased sensibility, that the self-tortured mind was the only home of true poetry; that there can be no better romance than that which haunts the ruins of a great, restless, and unhappy, because unsettled spirit; and that imagination cannot better busy itself than in talking musically to the world of fancied wrongs, or, it may be, of personal deformities, while it is admitted on all hands, that there are round us unsung, still new and strange beauties, springing continually from a vast and inexhaustible creation.

True pathos is not the pathos of a heart surrendered to its desolate feelings, but of one still left to the persuasion and guidance of its better ones. With many, nothing constitutes this quality, but a sort of restless, talkative and consequential melancholy. With others, the coloring of the picture must be of that mellow, tearful character, the mere gazing at which makes us sad. Now true pathos, we repeat, is something far better and greater than this—something distinct and determined; our feelings are awakened under it, as under the fine flow of music, swelling on us like an organ at that low chant in which we can hear our hearts throb to the intonations. This is the effect of true genius. It is the true melancholy. There is another that is easily inspired. It is drawn from common objects by common powers. But it requires more than common powers to stir the fathomless places of our nature, until they heave in sympathetic commotion with the spirit that rules them, even as deep answers unto deep.

The influence exercised upon our time, by personal character, and a certain character of poetry, as we can all testify, will warrant the foregoing remarks. It has been thought, and held, too, by some who were carried to it by no compulsion, and who would have progressed far better under a better faith, that there was no surer way to become famous than to become sad. This is no unattainable thing. It is no sure proof of great powers to bring about this spiritual fog, for the bard to light up with a mellowed and interesting illumination; and to play lord of the disconsolate, in this fashion, is, to our mind, but a poor intellectual capacity. There are times, indeed, when the bursts of a misanthropic spirit may bear out upon them the soul of poetry; but when the quick overflow of a full but bitter heart gives place to the continuous and deadly, but still *contrived* and factitious current of gloomy feeling, we are apt to question the reality of the suffering, or to be disgusted, where we are not amused, with the officious repeated tale of its endurance. It is not the character of true grief to talk loudly or long of its extremities. No one tells, year after year, of secret woes to the world, if he be really a martyr to them. The poetry which such sorrow employs is the poetry of selfishness. The taste it begets is a false one. The sorrow itself is a false sorrow. That such poetry should be favorably received with the sensible is a wonder; but the continuance of its fame must ever be questionable. The world is too busy to confine itself to the dark things of a single, isolated mind. It wants companionship--it wants delight, instruction. Byron will find his celebrity yet, we believe, in those nobler strains with which *himself* has least to do—in the sublime sentiments that he has caught from nature and sympathy, and invested with the peculiar and classic beauty of his genius. Rousseau may captivate the infected imagination by his pictures of self-inflicted misery and ruinous excitement; but who would not rather remember him in his abstractions from himself, and in his revelations of nature among the woods and waters of Geneva?

Poetry, then, has become a matter in which the people, as a mass, claim to be heard. It is something in which they claim an interest, as a reading, thinking, understanding public. This is not new, nor does the remark point to any thing new. It has ever been so, in a degree; for every human

being is alive to poetry, and is speaking or acting it every day of his life, when there is excitement about him. And this we say, notwithstanding the material, manufacturing, utilitarian character of the age. We are not, we trust, unaware of the disposition among all classes to ask concerning every thing else, as well as poetry, with all the pertinacity of the mathematician, "what does it *prove?*" What we intend to say is, that as an agent, it is operating more generally upon mankind. It enters into their sympathies, and makes a part of their necessary enjoyment. It has become the vehicle of information to their minds, and of new influences to their hearts. Holding such a rank among the pleasurable resources of life, it is certainly important that the spirit which shall animate it be of that elevating quality, of that unsullied, unadulterated character, to which the inspiration of well-regulated genius alone can attain.

What, then, it may be asked, is the style of poetry adapted to the taste and feelings of the age? We do not say the taste and feelings of England, separately—or of America—for we believe that upon this matter the sentiment is nearly the same in both countries. Unity of literary pursuit has generated between this and the father-land, a unity of opinion, in this instance, among many others, that cannot escape our notice. In answer, we would say, without hesitation, that so far as the common consent of its intelligent admirers can indicate the popularity of any species of literature, *that* appears to be the favored poetry of the time, which commends itself by the power and richness of its versification. We now speak, naturally, of its extrinsic character. It is not the age that takes particular delight in the cæsural melody of the stanza, as we find it in the poetry of Pope; nor yet in the patriarchal and gothic measure of Spencer. In these respects it is more of a golden age than that of either of those poetic fathers. Amongst the masters of the art, it is the time of vigorous conception, leagued with a chastened and graceful style, but not subservient to it; of high and beautiful thought, finding utterance in language suited to its character, and adorned with the attractions of a pure, manly, polished taste. We much doubt the lasting influence or value of that sort of poetry, which busies itself in the ultra intricacies of thought, bright and delicate as it may be; which hurries us along with a strange perti-

nacity, after the subtle imaginings of the excited mind, until we are lost in the mazes of the journey, or tired of the "long drawn" fancies that we are compelled to follow. It is not the time for the attenuation of metaphysical poetry. Images standing out in bold and naked relief—descriptions of Nature as she reveals herself in her simplicity and grandeur—and, above all, the palpable and strong emotions of the spirit, are, we believe, the instruments of that poetry which shall leave the impression of its power upon the age. The mighty spell of mind that brings before us in dread reality the alarm of Waterloo, when there was "mounting in hot haste," or the rattling tempest of the hills, when

> ——"Jura answers from her misty shroud
> Back to the joyous Alps who call to her aloud"—

disclose, after all, the stateliest magic of Byron—just as his pathos is more strikingly exhibited in those clear and unsullied escapes of feeling which his subject, and not himself, has produced. Campbell has stirred the hearts of half the world by a line of his Battle of the Baltic; while Moore has given us whole volumes on the dissection of a rainbow.

Of course we would not be understood to maintain that the great attributes of poetry have not heretofore been comprehended; or that new ones have been discovered. We not only do not maintain it—we do not say it. It would be ridiculous to do so, of what we consider to be an original ingredient in the human constitution. On the contrary, we hold that the grand properties of good poetry have ever showed themselves the same, from Homer's day to our own. But it has been reserved for modern times to bring them into exercise with a power and purity and elevation, which they could never boast before. Classical ornament, it is certain, still holds place as a property of poetical composition. Antiquity has long afforded a principal fountain whence poetry draws many of her choicest associations, and much of that material with which she illustrates and adorns her conceptions. This is a familiar truth.—But though such embellishment, under the direction of a good taste, undoubtedly has its value, at the present day we are disposed to believe that it does not retain its early importance as a literary ingredient; for it is evident that there are

others, of a nature full as valuable, and full as commanding, to bring it home to the bosom of the enthusiast—and why not of the scholar?—recognised by poetry; even its favorite allusions to those animating, everlasting principles that actuate us in the sublimest and best of causes, and its intimacy with the fadeless features of nature in her alternate moods of loveliness and magnificence.—Once, genius would deign to linger among none but vast and marvellous creations. Now, she has found a wider field for her efforts or for her revels among the less prominent, but not, on that account, less interesting objects that are ever about us. If, in some temple of finished and almost breathing statuary, or in some stern exhibition of heroic fortitude and valor, poetry once found all it could hope for of beauty and sublimity, she now recognises them in the great living models of moral power and loveliness; in the solitary but ever varying and wonderful works of nature; in the wide charities of virtuous and peaceful life. If she found strength in her images of Jove, or in the achievements of the mighty in war, she finds it now in her conceptions of a higher and holier sovereignty, or in the struggles of brave and good hearts in the cause of humanity. If she found pathos in the tragic sufferings of imaginary queens and heroes, or, again, in the lamentations of our first parents, driven from the gates of Paradise, she now finds it in the language of nature—in the unfeigned trials of the great and devoted who have not lived in vain—in the sorrows of man, since Paradise closed on him for ever—in the power of those peculiar and commanding griefs that history has treasured for the instruction of the world, and which are often, at once, the lot and lesson of mankind.

While upon this portion of our subject, we would revert to a consideration that seems to deserve some notice. We think it cannot have escaped observation, that poetical writers, in passing from the more royal and solitary walks of the art, have gone to the other extreme—and are now found circulating freely in the various childish resorts and play-grounds that philanthropic spirits are continually throwing open to the footsteps of youth. Without doubt this passage from the one sphere to the other is partly the result of that temper of the times to which we before referred, and which operates to bring down the mind to popular contact—as we may venture to express it, being of no politics—in almost all its de-

partments; but very much, we apprehend, is to be attributed to the strong disposition at present manifested to encourage the manufacture of verse of exceeding simplicity, "*for the use of children.*" To all this we have no objection, so it be managed within due bounds. The danger, if so grave a word need be used, consists in the liability to which poetry may be subject to be frittered away and reduced—not refined—by this process of simplification. For there are two kinds of simplicity—perhaps we are repeating what we have said before—one consisting in the direct disenthralled language which distinguishes great and forcible thoughts; the other in the unpretending juvenile strain that strips thought of all dignity whatever, and forces it down to the comparative nursery diction which marks the multiplying volumes of our youthful libraries. Many minds are disposed to regard the simplicity of Wordsworth as something as ineffable and insufferable as it is uncommon. With them, the word, in its application to this truly rare genius, is used in its worst sense. Now, for ourselves, we are inclined to point to Wordsworth as an instance of the quality of simplicity most admirably exhibited. The sublime singleness of his conceptions suffers nothing by the bold relief into which they are thrown by his language. There is no weakness, though his thoughts have not the parading support of words. There is no influence lost in the unencumbered beauty in which they go triumphantly home to the heart.

We are the more anxious that the true meaning of this term should be perceived and understood, from the chance we think it may have to abide of passing to the service of something far beyond and below it—to something that has much of the appearance of simplicity, without any of its virtues. There is a *natural* chord in the bosoms of us all. It ever responds in sympathy to the noble music of a spirit deeply and sincerely stirred. Here the vibrations of the heart, if they be given in poetry, will also be given in the language of true simplicity. And this is the kind of simplicity we would cultivate—and that too without condemning, so it be kept within bounds, the infantile guise in which poetry is introduced to the companionship of children. We only protest against confounding the simplicity of great thoughts with the simplicity of little ones.

The higher range of poetical exertion, to which it is our

intention to direct our remarks more particularly, supposes those qualities, in him who moves in it successfully, that constitute him a poet in the loftiest meaning of the term; as well as a certain set of sympathies, in those who accompany him with satisfaction. To write a song and compose an epic are two things. The author of a national lay, or a ballad, may have the power to quicken our pulses or start our tears, by the witchery of his verse, but prove an actual soporific in his attempts to charm by efforts of high pretension. The reason of this it may not be difficult to assign. It consists in the simple fact that different endowments are required for the two species of writing. True, the possession of one does not imply the absence of the other. There are instances of their perfect and happy combination; but the combination is rare in comparison with the gift of the poetic faculty. Most of us can recall our different emotions, on surrendering ourselves to the mellow cadences of beautiful hexameter with its rhyme, composition, and the commanding blank verse of a masterly and enkindling tragedy. With this recollection in mind, the force of our observation will be perceived, as connected with the less, and the more pretending efforts of the muse. They who have not poetry enough in their intellectuals to lead them to admit the truth of our doctrine as drawn from their own perception, would hardly be reached by any argument we might build upon it. Tragedy has ever been considered one of the Olympian walks of the poet. It is certain that in the cause of the drama, genius has put forth some of its pre-eminent efforts. Requiring uncommon vigor of style, a heroic strain of thought, and an adventurous spirit of imagination, an attempt at this species of writing may well rank amongst the most daring of poetical undertakings.

When we speak of the drama, we would be understood to refer to it in its purity. The neglect or absence of the distinguishing properties which constitute its legitimacy, it would be easy to point out in many modern instances. The departure from first principles in this department, indeed, has been frequently unpardonable; and such is the feeling of the age, in connection with this style of poetry, there is little hope, we fear, of a return to them. It is well known that a long and wordy war was engendered, aforetime, upon the matter of the technical rules to be observed in the con-

struction and conduct of the drama. It was a dispute almost as serious as any upon the real and symbolical presence. It became a settled conviction, however, that such things as time, place, and the common probabilities of life were affairs which poets, as well as readers, were bound to observe. Genius, it is true, sometimes leaped the barriers of the unities, and, in a few royal instances, roamed in uncontrolled and uncontrollable liberty through the fields of fancy. But the examples have not sanctioned the custom. Notwithstanding, however, the poetic spirit, in this respect, has felt the restraint of public opinion, it has made a new escape in the form in which it has latterly chosen to appear. Under the guise of a dramatic poem, it enjoys a latitude, both of conception and execution, which recognises almost entirely the old freedom from the technical canons. Accordingly, much of the finest poetry that has flowed upon England of late years, has been through this new channel.

There is a simplicity and unity—a unity of purpose—about this model of the drama, which, while they render the work unfit for representation, open at once a wide region for the ardent and excursive fancy of the artist. Tragedies, under this modification, are properly tragedies for the closet. They appeal to our taste and our poetic sympathies, rather than to our passions or our animal excitability.

And we are content that it should be so. We are content that the beautiful works of genius should be fashioned to meet only the intellectual eye—to be scanned in solitude—to delight us at our firesides. We have never been anxious that the Mysteries and Moralities should be summoned from their sleep of ages. "They sleep well." We have never been anxious to perpetuate any thing that recalls them, or to countenance any of the enormities of the scene that sometimes bring the modern stage into too decided rivalry with those monstrous spectacles. With equal reason we have no disposition to subject the purity and perfection of lofty tragedy to the present mutilating and fantastic spirit of the theatres. We shall not be understood, of course, to speak disparagingly of those standard plays that are tragedies indeed, and as such have been honored for generations—and which will bear representation and deserve applause, so long as the old fountains of inspiration are remembered; but we

would keep this sublime department of poetry from the encroachments of the popular demand for stage effect.

We are aware that in rendering to any writer the praise of priority among the constructors of modern English drama, we are rendering no uncommon honor. The glorious days of British tragedy have gone by; and we might trace, did our limits allow, an outline of its history to show its declension—the causes which produced it, and which now almost forbid a hope of its revival. But we must refrain. It is enough to say, that as the spirit of the Grecian drama lived in the lyrics, so the spirit of that of England early lurked in those admirable old ballads that constitute so considerable a mass of its dawning poetry; and that from these fountains the first draughts were the purest. The drama of our language has seen no day more promising than that which shone upon the morning devotees at its shrine. To follow its changes and its deterioration, would be to tread in a beaten track, or to linger upon a topic that has been amply treated by far worthier pens than our own. It will naturally be supposed that we are here speaking of the general tendency of this species of poetry. An exception like Shakspeare is not to be considered as affecting the rule. It is sufficient to know that the temper of the times and dispositions of writers have led men astray from the ancient high pathway; and it is quite an event to see a drama amongst us that can, even in some distant manner, bring back the old and good times of the splendid art. A lady, of whom England may well be proud, has done this in a striking degree; and though her plot mingles with no misty mythology, no all-pervading, all-powerful destiny, effecting its silent triumph as it proceeds, like the Greek drama, there is still a unity of purpose, of high and almost religious determination, that all but supplies that peculiar principle of the ancient tragedy, while it imparts to this a character still more elevated.

It has been said, and maintained with a degree of plausibility, that the progress of Christianity has been no help to that of poetry. It has been argued that religion, or religious feeling, as a principle or ingredient, has not been particularly favorable to the development of poetic genius under its best forms of attractiveness or energy. Doubtless

this remark, to a certain extent, is true. *In extenso*, we by no means subscribe to it. Though there be no subject on which men are so strenuous or so sensitive as their religion; though there be no one thing which you may not with less chance of resentment charge them with being without, or more safely attempt to take from them; yet, bring that jewel of their lives into a prominent consideration in your interchanges and reasonings, and it seems to lose half its sacredness and value by the transfer; as though what must be worshipped as a faith, deserved to be overlooked or depreciated as an influence--as though the sublime object of veneration in the temple were deprived of its intrinsic importance by its association with the best efforts of human thought, under the form of some stirring history or poem. This is a part of the common inconsistency of our nature.

Still, though the Christian religion, in its simple and severe exhibitions, may fail to render the poetry which embodies them less attractive than the common worldly principles on which most works of fancy are accustomed to turn, it would be unphilosophical to deny that illustrations of strong moral energy or power of endurance form the most popular, as well as the most elevating efforts of the dramatic artist. So far, then, as these may go, they exhibit a modification of the religious element, after all. We see not how this can be denied, if any connection or sympathy is to be allowed between religion and morality; and we feel safe in maintaining that this spirit—call it a moral or religious one, as you please—which forms its principle, its nucleus, as in the tragedies of Miss Baillie, is the true spirit of the drama.

Yet we are hardly ready to admit that the religious sentiment of our time, strongly marked as it often is by the spirit of sect, can be employed as an ingredient of the drama with a degree of success by any means commensurate with that which accompanied it in its earlier introduction. The religion which favors the highest efforts of poetry is an influence that awes mankind, without arraying man against his brother—a holy and resistless spirit of good, that points and leads the way to happiness, rather than a spirit of contention, that is too often thought to hallow a warfare that bends all our passions to its service without distinction. If the drama be founded upon the exhibition of this principle, as it at present obtains among us, it would seem that most of its

success, should it win any, would be confined to that class of believers who sympathized exactly with the writer. Amid conflicting parties, it is too often to be lamented that no large, embracing principle of faith will serve to nullify technical differences, and bring the mind, by a sort of centripetal force, to acknowledge a centering power of genius, in spite of a particular and differing creed in him who manifests it. This is melancholy. It is a weakness. Thus Pollock, the author of the Course of Time—no drama, though a poem—found his worshippers, and those who passed by on the other side, not only among those of the same generation, but of the same circle. It was his religious creed that gave him notoriety, we are disposed to believe, rather than the exhibition of religion as a principle, in the simple and commanding features which approve themselves to every man's conscience—rather too than the strong inspired language of poetry to which all hearts invariably respond.

We deem it hardly necessary to add here, that we are not to be understood as saying that we consider the strongest sense of natural religion of which humanity is capable, as the best foundation or principle of religious and sacred poetry; or that we should rest content with it as its chief, and best, and vital ingredient. What we mean to say is—because we cannot escape saying it, in honesty and soberness—that, as far as the cause and progress of poetry is concerned, we would rather see it, as it was in the hands of the great masters of old, than see it, in noble strain and strong language, advocating any peculiar religious feeling or sentiment, that would eventually subject it—and that justly—to the designation of bigoted or belligerant. Added to this, we would be understood as maintaining, most emphatically, that Christianity—the Christian religion—the revealed religion of Christ—must be considered as the only safe and satisfactory foundation and spirit of that sacred and religious poetry, which can hope, as such, to be received, or to be properly regarded by an enlightened age, as a strong minister to man of the saving principles from which it springs.

There is no subject connected with poetry, which demands more emphatic or serious consideration, than the great moral tone that marks it like the vein in the marble—the religious character of the deep principle which animates it. It is this tone—this character—that imparts to it not

only its virtue but its value. And while this is so, it certainly cannot be singular that sacred poetry should win and retain the place it holds with those spirits, which, open to all the mysteries of the lyre, can well appreciate its noble and lifting music. With this principle of the sky at his helm, the poet can sail triumphant and honored through any sea. Endowed with a vivid imagination, he can readily invest with a rich and harmonious coloring every object in nature or art, of mind or matter, upon which he may exercise the spell of his fancy. He grasps the prominent points of his subject with a bold hand and a high intention; and, under the rapid and beautiful analysis of genius, guided by truth, unfolds its various combinations, that rise like lights upon his march of inspiration. He delights in the simple but energetic emotions; in the deep but strong movements of pure hearts and great spirits; in the joy of happy memories, and the contemplation of high and invigorating realities. His visions are generally distinct, and his picture, in its glowing but delicate colors, attracts us by the magic with which it brings back some of the dearest dreams of our other years, and some of the holiest feelings which we have been accustomed to cherish. He rather prefers, in bold, vigorous outline, to bare the soul in some one absorbing excitement, to indulging in too refined speculations upon its nature—its mysterious movements—its subtle affections. He avoids swelling into bombast, or sinking into the common-place of mere sentiment. He depicts strongly, but with truth. He is not apt to forget the majesty of his art. He presents us a fine statue in the full grace of its proportions; but he remembers the drapery; and arranges it with the ease and taste of one whose genius is true to its work. His fervor is that of a mind impressed with the importance of things higher and better than those of earth; and it ever burns upward, like the flame from the holy altar. It comes to sanctify the kindest and best of the affections, and delights in the grand and deep revelations of those principles that honor and elevate man. But we resume our subject.

The Greek tragedy was peculiar; but it was certainly pure and perfect compared with that which succeeded it. It was grand and heroic, for it sprang from the lyrics. It glowed with passion. It abounded in rugged but natural conceptions. It formed the very religion of the time. It is

at present our object merely to refer to the great masters of the Grecian drama. The names of Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides are as familiar as household words—and their history is very generally and pleasantly remembered. Ancient poetry is embalmed with them; and themselves were embalmed in the pride and gratitude of their countrymen. These great spirits interwove the public events of Greece into their dramatic poetry, and made national concerns of their tragedies; thus, at once, registering the glories of their heroes, and presenting to the young men of their time the best models by which they could shape themselves in sentiment and character. In reward for this devotion to the art, their ambition was ministered to in a manner, or at least in a degree, peculiar to the age. They were the honored and the observed of their generation. It is not to be wondered at—to use the sentiment of a sensible French writer—that the Athenians, distinguished as they were by a lively imagination; a noble and musical language; singular fertility of genius, and eminent abilities, exercised by the most vigorous emulation, should have been excessively fond of poetry, and no less attached to those who displayed a strong spirit of ambition in that art, and a determination to excel in any of the employments that tended to illustrate or give it effect. For these reasons they honored, as a matter of course, not only dramatic poets, but actors.

The regard was reciprocal. From feelings thus generated and thus directed, much was to be expected that should advance the public mind on one side, and high-reaching vigorous poetry on the other. But all this prospect, bright as it was with promise, was doomed to be clouded. The Grecian theatre fell from its high estate, so soon as comedy took possession of the stage. The early form it assumed there was the most unamiable one in which it has ever appeared; and saving only the interval during which Menander moved to dignify it, and rescue the drama, there is little that presents itself upon which it is either pleasant or profitable to linger. We accordingly pass to a consideration of it as developed under auspices totally different, in another land.

The close connection with the stage held in early times by the drama, renders quite natural an application to the former of the passing remarks which we are submitting upon the prominent points in the history of the latter. In Rome

—to which we insensibly turn, as the light of poetry expires on the plains of Greece—in Rome, Plautus and Terence were identified with the stage. Yet these two were among the first and most prominent of the Latin dramatic writers. Both, too, were writers of surpassing power in their peculiar sphere. So pure and energetic was the language of Plautus, that Varro, a Roman of acknowledged learning and judgment, declared that if the muses were inclined to speak Latin, they would speak in the language of Plautus. Indeed, were more wanting to show the celebrity in which he was held, Varro has left, in addition, the following stanza upon his death:

> Postquam morte captus est Plautus,
> Comœdia luget, scena est deserta;
> Deinde Risus, Ludus, Jocusque, et numeri
> Innumeri simul omnes collachrymarunt.

Horace held opinions respecting this author, totally different, to be sure. But Horace lived in the Augustan age, when the Roman taste was at its height of refinement. The only commentary upon his criticism which we deem it necessary just now to submit, is the fact that for five hundred years Plautus continued the principal favorite of the stage. Still, we would by no means be considered the advocate of the drama and stage at this crisis. Both were exceedingly corrupt, and in that lamentable state they remained, exhibiting to a luxurious and dissolute people, every variety of extravagance and licentiousness which could be brought forth under the shadow of imperial patronage in its high places. Thus passed even the age of Roscius; and thus continued the theatre, even in what was then considered the home of its splendor and popularity, until genius withdrew from it, and under the vile and ridiculous personations of Nero, it fell into utter decay and dissolution.

The appearance of the drama in Spain was accompanied by that strange mixture of gloomy superstition and provincial farce which was too sadly peculiar to escape notice, in the early literature of that country. The great basis of the drama there was religion; and not only the ineffable absurdities, but the absolute blasphemies which were constructed upon it, are almost beyond belief. Lope de Vega and Calderon may, in many respects indeed, be exceptions from the

mass of Spanish writers who have made themselves so conspicuous by their extravagance; but even these, so justly held up as the poetic pride of that romantic land, must still be reckoned among those dramatists of whom Dr. Johnson says, "they gain attention by hyperbolical or aggravated characters, by fabulous or unexampled excellence or depravity; as the writers of barbarous romances invigorated the reader by a giant and a dwarf; and he that should form his expectations of human affairs from the play or from the tale, would be equally deceived."

Much of this general remark will apply to the drama as it appeared in Italy. It was distinguished by its inconsistencies, and by a ridiculous management of the most contemptible materials. In point of looseness and extravagance it rivalled that of ancient Rome; rarely boasting a virtue to redeem the mass of littleness and vice which seemed to be its prevailing ingredients.

It will be at once perceived that the course of observation in which we are here indulging is of that comprehensive character which our limits render proper, though not the one which, under other circumstances, we should incline to pursue. We speak of course of the state of poetry as it existed in those dramas, which issued from the hands of the mass of writers, and not of the masters. They who may be termed such, of which each land we have adverted to could certainly boast, gave birth to works whose range is the civilized world, and whose celebrity will remain while language endures. Still, even they can hardly be said to redeem their age; and though, in some leading instances, their genius stood proud and unshackled before the confusion of their time, they were not destined to escape it altogether, and necessarily partake, from their position, of some portion of the literary infirmities which distinguish their era. Such exceptions, while they serve only to bring into still stronger relief the moral and literary condition of the people from which they stand forth, cannot but "make the judicious grieve," when it is seen how much they might have done for their country's reputation and the cause of letters, had they not been subjected to such unhappy influences. How little, however, could be hoped for the progress of true learning in any department, when the common mind was ruled by the grossest superstition, and all that rose, by force of native

endowment, above the general level of degradation, were more solicitous to improve their condition for selfish purposes, than to enlighten the mass that heaved dimly and heavily below them!

In France the drama remained without form and void, till Corneille and Racine rose to illumine their age. Between these master spirits and the great Greeks, Sophocles and Euripides, a comparison by no means unapt might be instituted, and followed out successfully. Sophocles was distinguished by his power—so was Corneille. Euripides melted by his pathos—so did Racine. Each saw his leading trait in his mighty prototype. Yet the shape assumed by the drama under the magical genius of even such men, was so decidedly national as to forbid the recognition of it as the drama of Greece in her glory. The French drama, it is well known, is the drama of criticism. The character of the people formed an everlasting barrier to the progress of the true dramatic spirit among them. Its fervor degenerated to coldness. Impassioned action was sacrificed to the passion of etiquette; and France and her poetic champions saw nothing of the Greek drama, on the theatres, but the model. Corneille lived too late for his age; and though it was not till the noon of his fame—we think it was in Cinna—that he condescended to respect the unities, yet the great influence of the court and of popular character were at work before him; and though he might for ever have spurned or worshipped the technical rules of the art which he adorned, yet, in either case, he would have struggled unavailingly against the indomitable spirit of his time. Voltaire has somewhere said that the French were the least poetical people in the world; and offered it as a reason why no epic poem had been produced among them. It may with equal truth perhaps be said that legitimate pathos and a tragic sense are matters too incomprehensible with that people ever to allow a hope for the success of genuine tragedy among them.

But it is not our object to discuss the subject of poetry under its dramatic development in France, or, indeed, to review its history under any presentation in that country. We are rather desirous of examining its claims to consideration in instances of commanding popularity in our own language, and of contemporaneous celebrity; contenting ourselves

with the above cursory observations, which were naturally suggested from a glance at the art, as it exhibited itself in the different periods and lands to which we have adverted in our progress from the past to the present.

Meanwhile we would observe that many of these thoughts we have taken occasion to express before. Our sentiments, upon this great and interesting subject, remain unchanged; and we think that so mistaken has been much of the public feeling and opinion concerning it, in many of its particulars, there cannot be too strong or too frequent a recurrence to it in this way, as a subject of wide effect upon our literature, and of vast consequence in connection with our literary taste and our poetical reputation. It is time things of this kind should be viewed correctly as well as philosophically—and spoken of plainly, as well as with seriousness and truth. We hope the thoughts we have submitted in all humbleness, may lead to this excellent issue.

A few remarks upon our subject, as a matter upon which sad and severe criticism has too often been pleased to sit in judgment, will embrace all we have to say upon it at present, in this connection. And we are free to declare that we think it has been hardly dealt by, very unfairly examined, very erroneously judged, very ignorantly sentenced. We have taken occasion, on another page, to speak of the critical and poetical sentiments as rarely combined, and as affording, in most instances where they are assumed, very natural exhibitions of a want of sympathy. We have seen cases that may be called extremely hard ones, in this particular. The court which sat upon them had no title to its jurisdiction drawn from any portion of any healthy literary charter, or from common sense itself. Yet prosaic, unimaginative, unlearned as it was, it presumed to pass upon the matter it had irreverently brought to its tribunal, with all the circumstance and pretension with which it would pronounce upon subjects to which it might lay some claim of knowledge and authority. No one will deny that this is a highly dangerous proceeding in the business of criticism. It is dangerous as regards both the writer and the reviewer; for the former may be made bitter by the harsh and undeserved judgment to which he is subjected; or, on the other hand, expanded beyond all rational dimensions by the flattery with which he is dismissed; while the latter is sure to render himself emi-

nently ridiculous by his criticism in the minds of all whose literary judgment is untrammelled.

But we pass to a few closing considerations suggested by our still expanding subject. Poetry has seen times of greater veneration, indeed, than our own. Time was, as we have shown, when its votary was all but deified. The oaken crowns of Homer and Virgil proved the enthusiastic worship of their countrymen. But it was the worship of a listening and excited, not of a reading and thinking people. They were triumphs indeed that Racine and Voltaire could boast, when theatres rose up to them, and welcomed them as the poetic fathers of their country. It was high honor that encircled Petrarch, thought of as divine in his shadowy Vaucluse, and received as divine amidst the plaudits of all Italy. It was a proud thing for Tasso to be set apart for a crowning with laurel at the Capitol, in the midst of popes and prelates and cardinals. Yet the fame of the blind bard of the isles was not full, till temples and statues rose upon his ashes, and cities contended for the honor of his birth-place. The Latin poet commanded an admiration that derived its chief glory from the patronage and power of Augustus. The Euripides of France enjoyed a literary renown as great as a taste so decidedly national would admit, while the poet was torn between the struggles of his great genius and the tyranny of court criticism. Petrarch retains, in many of our recollections, but a romantic celebrity; and it is not the honors rendered, nor yet the coronation decreed him, that can blind us to the belief, that, in poetry, the highest moral elevation was not reached even by "Tasso the Repentant."*

Though the art, then, and its successful and commanding votaries may find that the period of their more peculiar and unqualified veneration has passed by, they need indulge no apprehensions about the destruction and decay of the principle of their influence. That principle is imperishable.

---

* "Il fut recu dons l'académie des Aethenei de Padoue sous le nom de Pentito, du Repentant, pour marquer, qu'il se repentait du temps qu'il croyait avoir perdu dans l'étude du droit, et dans les autres, ou son inclination ne l'avait pas appelé."—*Voltaire: Essai sur le Poesie epique. Le Tasse.*

It is founded as deeply and as securely as human nature itself. It appeals to feelings and sympathies that are born with us, and that go with us to the grave. We cannot escape its power, if we would. It stirs the heart like music, and finds its responses as unfailing as its pulsations. Those instances of submission to its enchantment, and of honor paid to its supremacy, to which we have adverted, though not repeated to the eye in this our day, are still no strange tribute in the spirit-land of sympathetic natures.

In this wholesome and honorable consciousness, then, let the poet find his unfailing satisfaction. His is a high duty; for he strikes his harp for the world—for the benefit as well as delight of his fellows, with whom he mingles on the broad pathway of life. His, too, is a high reward; for he finds it in the applause of the good and great, who render it to his genius in a still more unqualified strain, where the brilliancy of the poet is rendered yet brighter by the worth of the man. Such duty and such reward are surely better than those of an earlier and perhaps a more romantic age—and surely the best, disconnected with his art, which can await him on the common pilgrimage; and though to the mighty masters of a more enthusiastic but less enlightened period, the tribute of praise was rendered with more direct and almost royal manifestations, the regard with which the writer of true poetic power—of the true inspiration—is now met by an admiring people—a whole land—the world—may well be deemed equivalent to the best admiration which has been paid to genius on its most triumphant way.

ARTICLE VIII.

Some Observations on the Ecclesiastical and Religious Condition of England.*

A worthy governor of one of the New England States, in a proclamation issued during the last war with Great Britain, called upon his fellow-citizens to offer prayer for England, as "the bulwark of our holy religion." In this last clause there was, doubtless, more of truth than of prudence. Yet the blindest partisan, who was scandalized by that unfortunate phrase, might have admitted its substantial correctness. If any nation can be termed the bulwark of Protestant Christianity, it is England. This has been the case for several centuries. When our common faith has been assaulted, we have not looked to Holland or Denmark, but to England. On more than one occasion, she has stood in what seemed to be the last breach, has marched firmly up in the forlorn hope. In the field of argument, what nation can furnish so many Chillingworths, Barrows, Cudworths, Butlers? So it is now. True, indeed, she has not the mathematical or the medical science of France. She has not the multifarious and profound learning of the Germans. Possibly, in biblical criticism, she is behind us in the United States. But in the defence of Christianity, on general grounds, the whole Christian world, we apprehend, would look to England, spontaneously, for well-trained and

* This is the second of a series of articles which was commenced in the Repository for April last, (page 426,) with an essay on "Some of the Characteristics of the Present Age." Our reasons for consenting to withhold the name of the writer are stated in a note introductory to that article. The present communication has been made in pursuance of the design which was then intimated. The talent and research which it exhibits, we trust, will more than answer the reasonable expectations of our readers, and fully justify the confidence which we have expressed in the ability of the writer.

Editor.

trusty champions. We can confide in her good sense, in her well-grounded views, in her enlightened piety, in her freedom from hazardous speculation. Where, also, could we look, with equal confidence, in respect to the propagation of Christianity? Is the light to go forth from France? What can the feeble Protestants there do for the Pagan nations, cursed as they are with the atheistic capital, and fettered and hedged in, by millions of ignorant and bigoted Romanists? We fear that Germany will furnish, at present, but small assistance in the general diffusion of Christianity. Though we cherish more hope in relation to her piety and ultimate soundness in the faith than many around us are disposed to do; though we are aware that the German temperament and character, when pervaded by the spirit of the gospel, furnish excellent *materiel* for the Christian missionary, yet we cannot now depend on Germany for any considerable amount of aid. She is passing through a transition state, or rather through many transition states. We fear that a firm foundation is not yet laid. Much learning is making the Germans mad. While they are investigating the condition of all other nations, they have not kept their own vineyard. There is not homogeneousness enough. Their innumerable geographical divisions are a type of their religious and ecclesiastical state. To England, therefore, mainly, must the Christian and the philanthropist look for leaders in the great battle which is to be fought with the hosts of ignorance and superstition.

This prevalence of vital Christianity in Britain, and her means and desires to communicate it to the world, are a cogent reason why the people of the United States should become well acquainted with her character and resources, with her divisions, her principal ecclesiastical disputes, the main points in the intellectual development of her character; in short, we ought to know what we have to hope and to fear in respect to her co-operation, or her want of co-operation with us in enlightening and saving the world. We must become more familiar with the features of our ancient and venerable mother. We must study her capabilities, her tendencies, her prospects.

Another argument in favor of a more accurate knowledge of our English brethren is found in our increasing proximity to them. We do not refer here simply to the

augmented intercourse which has been effected between the United States and Great Britain by new modes of intercommunication. The inhabitants of the two countries are brought into contact in all parts of the earth. The two flags are waving, side by side, in almost every port. American missionaries are penetrating the immense colonial possessions of England in South Africa, in Western India, and in Burmah. The two nations are rival traders in the China Sea, in the North Pacific, at the mouth of the Columbia River. Collisions which *may* terminate in a war have unhappily occurred along our whole northern frontier. The emancipated British colonies in the West Indies will be, of course, objects of increasing, if not of painful, interest to our Southern States and Territories. In short, go where we may, colonize where we will, we shall find the anchor, or the harpoon, the tea-chest, or the Sheffield cutlery, the consul or the trapper, the commercial agent or the literary adventurer of the "mistress of the seas." In the holy city, and on Mount Lebanon, at the foot of Ararat, and on the ruins of Nineveh, the tracks of the English and American pilgrim are alike seen. Well, therefore, should each nation know the peculiarities of the other. Intimately associated as they are, under almost every climate, they should not come together in mutual ignorance, and consequently with mutual distrust and jealousy.

Again: England is now in a most interesting position. Her armies have lately crossed the mountain-barrier which separates Southern Asia from the plains of old Bactria, and they are now encamped within seven hundred miles of the Caspian Sea and of the videttes of the Russian camp. On the northeast and east of Hindoostan, Nepaul and Burmah seem to be waiting a favorable opportunity to pour down their hosts upon the British territories. A storm is apparently gathering against China which she may not be able to withstand, while the righteous Judge of the nations may have in store for her aggressor a cup of terrible indignation. It is not an impossible supposition that the British power in Asia may soon become, like the Roman, unwieldy, ready to fall in pieces by its own weight. Desirable as the continuance of the British sway may be, for the great interests of truth and righteousness, it may not be safe to rely too confidently on the permanency of that sway.

What England is in her colonies, she is, in certain respects, at home. Many things portend change. We cannot indulge either in exclusive fear or hope. Powers both of good and evil are strangely and fiercely at work. Her government is frequently called a *mixed* one, as being neither strictly monarchical nor republican. It is a fitting term. The elements of safety and destruction are mixed up in a wonderful degree. We read in one column of a British newspaper expressions of the profoundest reverence for existing institutions. The house of Brunswick is all but deified. Expenditures are joyfully and unconsciously incurred in order to support some worthless pageant, some shadow of the past, which would hazard the very existence of our republican institutions. In an adjoining column of the same journal, a freedom of thought and of language appears, at which we, in democratic America, stand aghast ; a freedom which would lead to an instant appeal to the civil courts, or to the exclusion of him who holds the unlicensed pen from the pale of gentlemanly intercourse. To-day, England seems on the verge of destruction ; to-morrow, sailing over untroubled waters ; now convulsed by some outbreak of her undisciplined peasantry ; now inundating the royal palace with the most loving and obsequious epistles to those who are appointed to be a "terror to evil-doers." During one session of Parliament, the three estates of the realm move on without interference ; in the following session, there seems to be nothing but collision, jealousy, mutual and sharp recrimination. England is a riddle to herself and to others. We cannot solve an enigma so dark. We are unable to pry between the folded leaves of her destiny.

Who of us perfectly understands British institutions, or that complicated, evanescent, yet substantive thing, English character ? Even those who have repeatedly visited the mother-land cannot unravel every mystery. Let us select one or two illustrations.

The British constitution is sufficiently party-colored and heterogeneous. It cannot be surveyed with geographical precision ; and no one, it has been said,* but a foreigner, who of course sees only the outside of things, ever attempted such a work. It glories in being anomalous and indescribable.

* British Critic, No. 50, p. 346.

It may be defined as a collection of various independent forces, a federal union, not of territorial states, but of different political powers occupying the same ground, and vested in the same population. Among these distinct powers are the Episcopal church, the monarchy, the peerage, the commons, the universities and other corporations, civil and ecclesiastical, the gentry, trial by jury, the interpretation of the law as vested in the judges, also certain principles, such as the insular jealousy of foreign interference, and, at the same time, the necessity of some peaceful understanding with other nations, the principle of democracy and voluntary combinations, the regard for prescriptive rights and personal liberty, etc. The pillars of this constitution, it has been remarked, are the gifts of as many kings, not contemporary, as the contributors to the temple of Ephesus; they are the thirty kings of thirty successive generations. Every age, every race of man, every political epoch, has contributed its quota to the whole. The names of Alfred, Edward the Confessor, the Norman Conqueror, the barons, the burghers, Thomas á Becket, Simon de Montford, the Edwards, the houses of York and Lancaster, Henry VIII. and his children, Cranmer, the Stuarts, Laud, the Puritans, William of Nassau, and the house of Brunswick, recall not merely historical events, but existing portions of the British constitution. Who can accurately understand the mutual relations, or, what may be, salutary collisions of these diverse elements? Especially what American, whether he has seen, or has only read of, the practical working of the system, will venture very confident assertions?

Let us select one of these distinct powers or elements, the old universities. We have never seen the book or the living teacher that could satisfy our curiosity on the subject. The foreign tourist seems to be in as deep a darkness as his untravelled neighbor. The substance of his knowledge is, that Oxford is a *congeries* of buildings, a collection of monastic institutions, where certain fellows enjoy their *otium cum dignitate*, and hand down to their successors a profound regard for the apostolical succession, and a due contempt for dissenters. How can a casual visiter appreciate such an establishment, a monarchy by itself, an *imperium in imperio?* Perhaps none of the incorporated bodies of Great Britain are so little understood, even by natives, as the universities

and colleges. This is owing in part to the fact that the statutes of those institutions are either inaccessible or but little read, and in part to the difficulty and tedium of wading through such long and minute regulations, written in half-barbarous Latin. There is, also, considerable risk of misapprehending their true meaning, unless the inquirer is familiar with the actual administration of the university or college. The difficulty is much increased by the frequent engrafting of new endowments on the old stock.* Many of those who have been educated at Oxford or Cambridge, remarks a very intelligent writer,† will yet be found to have a very indistinct, as well as imperfect, notion of their nature and objects. A correct account, the same writer continues, of the actual condition of one or both of these academical bodies, would contain more of real novelty to the greater part of the reading public, more information which they did not previously possess, than most books which are published; and yet, perhaps, an account of the present state of the Chinese empire would be perused with more interest. Every one is accustomed to the *names* of Oxford and Cambridge. Few are aware how little they really know about the *things*.

These instances are sufficient to demonstrate both the importance and the difficulty of a thorough acquaintance with the institutions and the character of our English brethren. We are virtually pledged with them as co-laborers in the world's renovation. We are descended from a common ancestry, are sharers in the same glorious recollections; we have one speech, and, in certain important respects, the same civil institutions. England is now trembling with solicitude, not knowing what is to befall her. Some of her best and most accomplished men, of various parties, anxiously await, for different reasons indeed, the developments of a single session of Parliament, or the daily news from one of the great and excited manufacturing districts. A whig ministry retains its feeble hold on life by the dissensions or the sufferance of its adversaries. Yet it is not certain that the nation would bear any other than a whig administration.

---

* Prof. G. Long in the 2d Publication of the Central Society of Education, London.

† British Quarterly Journal of Education, I. 9.

The ecclesiastical establishment is menaced from various quarters. How long it will remain to promote the well-being of the realm according to the opinion of some, or to be the source of countless mischiefs according to the theory of others, none can tell.

On this debatable ground we propose, for a few pages, to enter. We do not promise to unravel any of the complicated threads. We may not be able to throw any light on a single dark recess. We shall endeavor, however, to present some facts and considerations which may, possibly, aid the reader in forming some right conceptions of events and characters so interesting. Before we proceed to describe the more important parties into which the religious public in England are now divided, we will hazard a remark on certain characteristics of the *mass* of Englishmen.

In the first place, they are a *practical* people. With the exception of one or two important classes of men, hereafter to come under consideration, they are earnest devotees to that which is solid and useful. They have no intention of renouncing the good things which can be handled and measured, for any time-worn or sublimated theory concerning the good, the true, the beautiful. All this, is with them fond fancy, or German metaphysics. It has no relation to the calm judgment and well-balanced understanding of the Englishman. This love for the tangible and the outward is predominant in almost every circle and party. The dissenters are a bustling and active race. No men know how to labor for present effect better than those who are called after John Wesley. The Friends are proverbial for thrift and worldly wisdom. The evangelical party in the establishment, acknowledging such leaders as Scott, Newton, Romaine, Cecil, Simeon, are of course practical men. We can scarcely recall the name of an abstract philosopher or a hard thinker among them. The energetic Daniel Wilson of Calcutta, is a specimen and illustration in point. If we turn to the political circles, the characteristic in question is no less obvious. Those who acknowledge Jeremy Bentham as their high priest and oracle, will by no means cherish an undue regard for the past. In the misty ages which are gone, the greatest-happiness principle was not honored. The radicals of every genus and species are idolaters of the present, and turn with detestation from all theorizing, except

that on the rights of man, from all principle, except that of the equal distribution of civil rights and privileges. The House of Commons is pre-eminently a common-sense, business set of men. It is to be doubted whether they would listen patiently if a second Burke were to appear with his exuberant stores of imagination and of philosophy. The statesman would be in too high a region for auditors who so delight in the figures of arithmetic, in calculations of loss and gain, in considerations which are easily grasped and can be at once put to the test. Burke, in perhaps a better day of the House of Commons, with all his splendor of imagery and profound views, sometimes spoke to a small and impatient auditory. Indeed, the influence of the national legislature appears to be a main cause of that practical tendency for which the English are renowned the world over. The student of the University, who is preparing for public life in the Senate, must shape his education to his destiny. He must beware of becoming too much of a philosopher. He must see that his stores of knowledge are well arranged and assorted, legibly stamped and correctly labelled, so that when the time of trial comes, his bundle of facts and principles may be ready for use at the moment wanted. Lord Jeffrey, the Coryphæus of the Edinburgh Review, was preceded to the Commons by a splendid reputation. Yet he was doomed to suffer disappointment because his talents were not fitted to his sphere. The style of the elaborate reviewer, or even of the acute lawyer, possessed but few charms for the men whose ears were familiar with the details of beer and corn laws. A late distinguished professor of Greek at Glasgow, the well-known translator of Thiersch's Greek Grammar, went into Parliament with large experience as a popular and able speaker in opposition to the reform bill. But the elegant scholar, the prize-man at Oxford, the accomplished Grecian, utterly failed in the Senate. His graceful periods fell on untuned ears. He went back to his college broken in heart, and soon died a prey to grief, and a warning to scholars to refrain from plunging into the sea of politics. We, by no means, deny talent, acquisition, taste to the Commoners of the United Kingdom. The intellectual power of the empire is there, in a great degree, concentrated. But it is talent of a peculiar kind ; it is power of a specific form ; it is genius without a will of

its own; one channel, and but one, is prescribed for its exercise; it must shape its energies in one direction; it must bend all its force to carry or to repel a particular measure. Something is to be done, or to be prevented, on the spot. Ultimate effects are kept out of sight. The intrinsic right and wrong of the deed is covered up. Comprehensive and far-extending views are scouted as visionary, as belonging to Plato's Republic, or to Sir Thomas More's Utopia. In this way, the mind of the parliamentary orator is hemmed in to a vexatious expediency, and no thanks to his daily routine of duties, if it is not effectually humbled and prostrated.

This tendency of the English mind is seen in the devotion of many of her ablest scholars to the physical sciences. Most of those who have acquired a distinguished reputation in foreign lands are of this class. Such are Sir John Herschell, Dr. Faraday, Whewell, Sedgwick, Lyell, Airy, Peacock, Buckland, Bell. The British Association for the Advancement of Science, in its numerous sections and subdivisions, is almost wholly confined to the natural and mechanical sciences. Literary and moral subjects, (perhaps appropriately, we are simply stating the fact,) are excluded. Nearly all the learned national societies are devoted to the same class of objects. Such are the Royal Society, the Royal Institution in London, the Geological, Geographical and Astronomical Societies, etc. Again, the patronage of the government is conferred on those who distinguish themselves in this line of pursuit. It is the discoverers of land, the navigators of unknown seas, the meteorologists, the geometricians, who are rewarded and stimulated by the notice of government.* We do not complain of these things. The brows which wear these laurels are worthy. We wish that honors in the shape of pecuniary rewards were far more munificently granted than they are. But while these things are done, the others should not be left undone. We do not know why the mental philosopher is not as worthy as the machinist of the pecuniary encouragement of government. Did not

* We do not forget the gifts which were tendered to Mrs. Hemans, Coleridge, Sharon Turner and some others in the walks of literature. But how few and scanty have been the tributes bestowed on genius employed in poetry, moral philosophy, civil history, and the kindred branches!

Dugald Stewart confer by his oral teaching and his written works as much solid advantage on his country as was communicated by the experiments of Sir Humphrey Davy? The latter saved the life of the Cornwall miner; the former educated and enriched the immortal mind in the four quarters of the world. Why is he who makes a trigonometrical survey of England, or who examines the tides that wash her coast, honored by the bountiful gifts of his sovereign, while he, who surveys the territory of mind, with a patient and discriminating eye, or who guages the tides of thought and feeling which rise and fall in man's bosom, must live and die unrewarded, perhaps leaving those whom he loves dependent on charity for their daily bread? Facts like these certainly show what is the predominant tendency of the English mind. A proposition to confer a pension on Dr. Thomas Brown would, probably, have been received by the English government with contempt.

Another characteristic of the whole British people is self-esteem, or pride, or, to choose a softer term, patriotism. When the honor of the British name is concerned, all minor differences vanish. Churchman and Dissenter, Whig and Tory, even the Radical and Chartist, vie with each other in demonstrations of loyalty and of national pride. When the island was threatened with invasion by Bonaparte, all intestine feuds were instantly hushed, and but one heart was beating from the Land's End to the Orkneys. So in the late splendid victory of the British arms in central Asia, the murmur of faction was lost in the general joy. Even the petulant and fault-finding Blackwood was compelled to suspend his onset on the whig administration, and commend the energy and skill of the Indian government. An instance of a different complexion, though revealing, substantially, the same feeling, was furnished by the death of the princess Charlotte of Wales. A nation was in tears. A whole people mourned as one mourneth for an only son. Thus also with not a few of the associations with which British story is crowded. Many illustrious names are the common property of all classes. Milton, the Puritan and the commonwealth's man, is enshrined in the affections of the prelate and the peer. At the name of Bishop Butler, the congregationalist forgets his dislike to the mitre and to the three orders in the priesthood. The fame of Wolfe, Nelson, Wellington, is a com-

mon inheritance. No party, no sect can monopolize it. Here, on this English feeling, the patriot is disposed to think that the last hope of his country may be safely placed. If every other dependence should fail, here is solid rock. When you touch a certain theme, when you strike a particular chord, partisanship is merged, mutual hatred is in abeyance ; rival and exasperated religionists lay down their arms. One mighty tide of pure British feeling courses through all breasts. This was what Bonaparte found to be invincible ; this was what wrested Europe from his grasp.

Connected with this feature in the British character, and perhaps growing out of it, is a disposition to disparage that which is foreign. The patriotism degenerates into bigotry and exclusiveness. Nothing is worthy of regard except it have the English imprint. It sometimes appears in the form of a supercilious disdain of whatever has a foreign accent or garb. Hence the common report that the British traveller on the continent of Europe awakens more prejudices and meets with more collisions and petty annoyances, than the sojourner from any other nation. He is superior, in many respects, to multitudes whom he meets, even in the most civilized regions ; yet he is too conscious of it, and accordingly obtains little credit, if he does not provoke retaliation and rebuffs. He obeys the injunction of the apostle in letter, not in spirit, or rather in the letter of the English version. He *condescends* to men of low estate, and as nearly all with whom he meets are, in his view, men of low estate, his whole life is a series of *condescensions.* This *hauteur*, this assumed superiority, is not confined to the gentry, to the higher classes, to the ancient families of the nobility. Possibly it is less discoverable in the upper circles than in some others. Excellent gentlemen in the middle classes of society betray this same spirit of self-conceit and of contempt for their neighbors, perhaps unwittingly, and with no intention to give offence. We sometimes meet it in quarters where we should least expect it. The Quarterly Review, and Blackwood's and Frazer's Magazines, the British Critic and the British Magazine, might be expected to give proof of their powers of wit and raillery at the expense of us poor Americans. But the organs of the dissenters ought surely to divest themselves, if it is within their ability, of modes of thinking and of phraseology which

in them are not seemly.* We have no objection to fair and impartial criticism, even if it is severe. Doubtless, the

* We will throw some proofs of our charges into a note. The London Eclectic Review is a publication of great ability, and, in general, kind and courteous towards the people of this country. We have taken great pleasure in reading the successive numbers of the work for several years. It is no honor to our literary community that the Review has not been republished here from the beginning. If it rarely reaches, in power, an occasional article in Blackwood, yet it is wholly free from the silly trash which crowds many of the pages of the Northern Tory Journal. Yet even in the Eclectic, the national characteristic to which we have adverted, will sometimes break out. The tendency cannot be entirely suppressed even in that courteous and liberal journal. In a review of Dr. Porter's Lectures, Jan. 1840, we meet with the following sentence, the italics in which are our own: "Like the *generality* of the theological publications of our transatlantic brethren, the work is respectable. To originality it makes no pretension, but it is written with good sense and moderation, and is deeply imbued with the spirit of piety. Like *all* the publications, however, which have appeared in that country, it manifests a most deplorable deficiency in the knowledge of the best English books, and especially in the department of sermons." After mentioning the names of ten writers of sermons that are omitted in Dr. Porter's list, the writer proceeds: "We should have thought that such omissions were beyond even the capacity of *Anglo-American* ignorance of English classics." Again, Feb 1839: "*Most* of the American religious miscellanies are either defective or redundant. They are generally too sectarian and bigoted to be extensively useful, or they are filled with disputations upon recondite topics, which are comparatively of minor importance, or which cannot satisfactorily be elucidated." In a notice of Malcom's Travels, March 1840, the reviewer closes thus: "We have no wish to point out faults where the intention is so benevolent, and the general composition is so respectable; else we should spend a few critical remarks on the *patois* of *New England*, and a few vulgarisms which we know not how to classify. Perhaps *they* also are idiomatic to our transatlantic brethren." Let us, with all deference, quote some of the *patois* and *vulgarisms* of old England. "The more Christians are present the less will there be of confusion and

people of the United States have literary offences enough to answer for. We do not, however, like insinuation, innuendo, sweeping assertion, or a self-complacent, though it may be tacit, assumption, that the English are the people, and that wisdom will die with them. Why do not our 'transatlantic brethren' judge us with the close observation, stern impartiality, discriminating kindness of the Frenchman, De Tocqueville, or even of Chevallier? One of our answers would be, that the English have always hated the French. They have cherished a settled antipathy towards their Gal-

---

profanity,"* etc. *Eclectic Rev. Sept.* 1839, *p.* 320. "And who have therefore *plenty* of time," etc. *Ib. Jan.* 1840, *p.* 11. "If a man had the genius of an angel, and the knowledge of an angel to *back* it." *Ib. p.* 12. "The ghost of his own consistency would scare him into such hysterics, that his prize-money would glide, guinea after guinea, into the pockets of some sapient son of Esculapius, before his locks could be sufficiently combed down either for the weight of a mitre, or the venerable cauliflower of an archdeacon." *Ib. Feb.* 1839, *p.* 134. "Because of the unceasing endeavors which are *being made*." *Tracts for the Times*, *No.* 5. "Prevent matters from *progressing* further." *British Critic*, *vol.* XXV. *p.* 398. "The teacher is all along aware that something is *being withheld* from the taught, and this not only from the mere necessity of the case, but also as best for him; the things kept back seeming as yet not so well for him to know. Of *course* the *course* and order to be followed, the principle upon which any such *reserve* is *observed*," etc. *Ib p.* 258. Truly *cacophony* is not *being withheld* from such sentences. "Although he *settled* as a Presbyterian minister." *Stephens's Life of Sharp.* In the principal British Reviews and Magazines, both secular and religious, we find a constant use of words and phrases which have been denounced as pedantic *Americanisms*,† and which are not used by good writers on this side of the Atlantic. We have marked some words in the London Christian Observer, which are certainly not New England *patois*. In the December No. 1839, of the Eclectic Review, there is a brief article on some of the dialects spoken in England. From the specimens given, we should infer that they are not dialects of the English language, whatever else they may be.

* See Pickering's Americanisms.

† We refer to such words and phrases as *talented*, *literality*, *lay* for *lie*, as, Shall I lay down? *iterate*, *entirely*, *acidulate*, etc. etc.

lic neighbors, which has predisposed them to judge uncandidly of all other nations. This anti-French feeling has, in some cases, as in that of Coleridge, amounted almost to a frenzy of hatred. The insular situation of England, it must be confessed, is unfavorable to the cherishing, on the part of her inhabitants, of large and magnanimous views. This infelicity of location is not counterbalanced, in all respects, by the immense colonial possessions. These distant colonies of pagans hardly constitute an integral part of Britain, so far as their effects on the feelings and character of Englishmen are concerned. The great nations on the continent of Europe are more favorably situated in this respect, and have exhibited a modification of character accordingly.

Should our position on this subject be controverted, we have only to say that the whole civilized world would accord in our verdict except the 'island empress' herself. At the same time, though we lament this national weakness, none can be more prompt than ourselves in admiration and love of the British character. It may have forbidding features and unpleasant excrescences; the Englishman may be too conscious of his own merits, and too ready to undervalue others in the comparison, yet there is soundness at the bottom; the substratum is firmly laid. We can *trust* an Englishman, which is more than we can confidently affirm of some of the continental tribes. England has forethought, wisdom, energy, philanthropy, and these are, through God, saving the world. She may make unseemly boasts, but she does not fail you in the breach; her deeds of light are chronicled on almost every shore. Her philanthropy and faith will yet gladden every clime.*

We are now prepared to consider, more in detail, the religious condition of England. We shall do this, however, with all the brevity which is consistent with an intelligible presentation. As preliminary, a slight historical sketch may not be without its value. It may throw some light on the present ecclesiastical differences in England.

---

* We fear that a sad exception must be made in respect to China. Will England consent to the stupendous iniquity of forcing opium upon an innocent, and, in this respect, more virtuous people?

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, there were three parties in the Established Church, the Reformation party, of which the present evangelical school in the church claim to be descendants; the High Church, or Laud party, kindred, in some respects, to the present Oxford School; and the Latitudinarians, whose founder was Archbishop Tillotson. Dr. Birch, in his life of that prelate, remarks, that in the age of remarkable dissoluteness in which Tillotson lived, he judged that the prominent presentation of the principles of *natural religion* would be the best way to put a stop to the growing impiety. The great design of Christianity, in his view, was to reform men's natures, restrain their appetites and passions, and raise their minds above the interests of the present world. Cardinal Maury remarks, that the English pulpit, about the year 1700, from being an arena for politics, became, almost exclusively, a school for the moralities of social life. In proof of this he refers to the Boyle Lectures, from Bentley to Derham, including Kidder, Williams, Gastrell, Blackall, Harris, Stanhope, the two Clarkes, and Whiston.

At the same time, no divines asserted more strongly than Tillotson and Burnet, the doctrine that the Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants. In consequence, the Laud, or High Church School, assailed the Archbishop with the utmost acrimony. Still, Tillotson was far from what we should term an evangelical divine. He has, in his sermons, numerous statements of Christian doctrine, but as a whole, they are very deficient in the peculiarities of the system of grace. Burnet's exposition of the Articles has been termed one of the most anti-evangelical works in the language, its chief object being to rescue the Anglican Confession from the hands of old reformers, or the reformation divines, and to show that it might be so softened as to be approved by Latitudinarian Theologians.* The Tillotson party triumphed over the School of the Reformers, who had become nearly extinct. It also overwhelmed the party of Laud. "The great majority of the bishops and clergy," says the work just referred to, "became Tillotsonians, as to their general doctrines and preaching, subscribing to the Thirty-nine Articles rather as articles of peace than as ex-

* London Christian Observer, XXXIX. p. 82.

pressing their own opinions, and absolutely abhorring the book of Homilies, which they contrived to suppress, and which they nearly banished out of the land." The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was, for several generations, almost exclusively under their control.

From about the beginning of the seventeenth century, or even earlier, it appears to be conceded on all hands, that there was a rapid decline of religion in the Episcopal Communion, till little was left of its vitality. Indeed, the moral doctrines which Tillotson had so earnestly inculcated, gave way before the torrent of ungodliness. Multitudes of the clergy were sadly infected with the spirit of the times, and not a few became the most accomplished leaders in the turf, in the fox-hunt, and other anti-Christian and profligate scenes. A sufficient proof of the low state of morals is seen in a letter which George III. addressed, in 1772, to Dr. Cornwallis, Archbishop of Canterbury, and primate of all England. It began thus: "I could not delay you the notification of the grief and concern with which my breast was affected, at receiving authentic information, that *routs* had made their way into your palace. At the same time, I must signify to you my sentiments on this subject, which hold these levities and vain dissipations utterly inexpedient, if not unlawful, to pass in a residence devoted to divine studies," etc. This Dr. Cornwallis had been a bishop some three and twenty years. Bishop Butler, who died in 1752, has the following decisive language: "It is come, I know not how, to be taken for granted by many persons, that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry; but that now at length it is discovered to be fictitious. And, accordingly, they treat it, as if, in the present age, this were an agreed point among all people of discernment, and nothing remained, but to set it up as a subject of mirth and ridicule," etc.

About the time when Bishop Butler was penning the above ominous sentences, the fathers of Methodism were seeking to awaken the zeal of a slumbering church. Crowds attended their preaching wherever they appeared. The largest edifices were too small to contain their auditors. Among the mass of the people, a most salutary religious influence was revived and propagated by their zealous labors. Even some in the aristocratic circles felt the invigorating warmth of this new movement. The extremes of society were

brought together by the simple exhibition of the doctrine of the cross. The good fruits of this religious awakening were extended in all directions. Lady Huntington, though firmly attached to the Church of England, was in habits of intimacy with various members of the dissenting body, and encouraged their labors to the utmost extent of her power. By these means, an evangelical party was gradually formed in the bosom of the Established Church. In the lives of Whitefield, Lady Huntington and their associates, we are perpetually meeting with the names of Hervey, Venn, Berridge, Romaine, Walker, Fletcher, Grimshaw, Newton, Milner and others. Mr. Venn, in common with many of his clerical brethren, frequently preached at Lady Huntington's chapel in London. The conversion of Joseph Milner, the Church Historian, was accomplished by the ministry of the students sent by Lady Huntington to Hull. The first Methodist society had been formed in 1739; but it was not till about 1765, that the organization of the body was so extensive as to include a hundred preachers in Great Britain and Ireland; the number of members being 26,000. In three and twenty years afterwards, the number both of preachers and members had nearly trebled.*

From 1765 to 1783, the nation was occupied with the great struggle of the American colonies, first for liberty, and then for independence. The dreadful convulsions in France soon followed. Immorality and Atheism of course abounded, and the love of many waxed cold. This sad state of things awakened the compassionate zeal of Mr. Wilberforce, who published his Practical View in 1797, a work of which the British Critic, in the following year, thus speaks: "In recommending to the public one of the most impressive books on the subject of religion, which has appeared within our memory, we entirely agree with the author on the necessity that exists for awakening many nominal believers to a recollection of the most important doctrines of Christianity, and an active and heartfelt sense of religion." Among the higher ranks of the clergy, not a few were powerfully influenced by this volume. The younger members of the profession, especially, were deeply affected. In the opinion of Bishop Wilson, of Calcutta, the book tended to form a school

* Eclectic Review, Jan. 1839, p. 9.

in divinity. It raised up a large and important class of writers, who propagated the sentiments which they imbibed from their master. Among these writers was Mrs. Hannah More.*

The condition of things in a portion of the English establishment about thirty years since, (1810,) may be inferred from the correspondence which took place between Bishop Jebb, an Irish prelate, and his friend and spiritual tutor, Mr. Alexander Knox. Not a few, both of the English and Irish clergy, were men of worldly, if not of profligate habits; many neglected even the external decencies of their profession. Knox and Jebb thought that they could establish a better school than either the evangelical or the worldly. Jebb, in a letter addressed to a clerical friend who had been attending a ball, thus speaks: "The truth is, I had almost ventured to anticipate the growth and diffusion of a higher principle than commonly prevails even in the religious world; a union of strict spiritual religion with a rational and somewhat philosophic temperament of mind; a separation from the world more complete because more interior, more penetrative because less palpable, than has been hitherto attained by the most systematic plans of external exclusion. By carrying common sense, rationality, and discreet cheerfulness along with us, I did expect that we might, in time, recommend serious religion to the judgment and taste, no less than to the hearts and consciences, of those around us." In the Remains of Knox, we find the germs of the late Oxford movement. About twenty-four years since, he wrote as follows: "No church on earth has more intrinsic excellence than the English Church, yet no church, probably, has less practical influence." "Hitherto, though more temperate in her measures than any other portion of the reformed body, she has manifested no sentiment with such unremitting intensity as dread of whatever could be deemed Popery. I deny not the expediency, perhaps the necessity, of this feeling in such circumstances as have hitherto existed. But it has given safety to the Church of England at the expense of perfection; which last can be attained only by proving all things, and holding fast that which is good; and this dis-

* We shall make some remarks on this school in our next article.

crimination can be practised only in the absence of prejudice. As matters are, dread of transubstantiation has made the sacrament a ceremony; and to ward off infallibility, every man has been encouraged to shape a creed for himself." Mr. Knox then proceeds to predict that *men shall arise fitted*, both by nature and ability, to discover for themselves, and to display to others, whatever yet remains undiscovered, whether in the words or works of God.

The men whose *rise* was so confidently predicted, appeared, as perhaps Mr. Knox, if living, would have acknowledged, about eight years since, in the University of Oxford. The famous "Tracts for the Times" were commenced in 1833. The series now comprehends five or six volumes, accompanied by a light array of separate tracts, sermons, letters and poetry, and ably supported by reviews and articles. They are frequently termed Oxford Tracts, or Oxford Theology, from the circumstance that the most prominent writers are connected with that University.* The individual most known, at least out of England, is the Rev. Edward B. Pusey, D. D., regius professor of Hebrew, and the successor of the distinguished Prof. Nicoll. About 1825 or 1826, he spent a year in Germany, and is said to have left a very pleasing impression of his talents and piety in the hearts of many friends. After his return to England, he engaged in a controversy with the late Hugh James Rose, Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge, who, in a publication, entitled, "The State of Protestantism in Germany Described," had maintained, among other things, that the prevalence of neological opinions in Germany was owing in part to the want of High Church principles in that country. To this production, Dr. Pusey replied in a Historical Inquiry into the Causes of the Rationalist Character of the Theology of Germany, in which he attempted to set aside the assumption of Mr. Rose. His treatise displayed much learning and ability. After having maintained the argument with his High Church opponent, it could not but occasion some surprise to find his name among the *Tractators* at Oxford, to adopt an English term. He is the author

* It ought to be mentioned that powerful opponents to the new views have arisen at Oxford in Dr. Shuttleworth, Prof. Hampden, Powell, etc.

of many of the Tracts, to some of which he subjoins his initials. He has also written a long letter to the Bishop of Oxford on the "Tendency to Romanism imputed to doctrines held of old as now in the English Church."

Another leading writer is the Rev. John H. Newman, B. D., fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. He is said to have been much indebted to the friendship of Archbishop Whateley. He published, some years since, a work on the Arians of the fourth century, which, it was thought by many, contained some very exceptionable passages. Another valiant champion is the Rev. W. F. Hook, D. D., curate of a church in Leeds, and is said to have a crowded attendance on his sermons. Among his other publications is, "A Call to Union on the Principles of the English Reformation." The eccentric missionary Wolff, terms him and Pusey and Newman, "pious, good, holy and excellent men," though on some points Dr. Hook does not go so far as his Israelitish friend. Dr. Hook and Mr. Churton, according to the British Critic, represent the High Church dignitaries of the last generation. Rev. John Keble, professor of poetry in the University of Oxford, (an office nearly if not quite nominal,) is of the country clergy, and "comes from valleys and woods, far removed both from notoriety and noise." Mr. Keble is author of some of the Tracts, and has published a visitation sermon on Tradition, which has been subjected to much animadversion. He is the well known author of the volume of poetry called "the Christian Year," reprinted in Philadelphia under the auspices of Bishop Doane. It has had a wonderful popularity in England. It is full of the most delicate thoughts and of the sweetest poetry. A Romanist observes of it, that it is an attempt to collect and form into a crown the scattered jewels which the torrent of the 16th century has left to the English Church. Among the other writers of this school are Mr. Percival, who "represents the Tory aristocracy;" Mr. Palmer and Mr. Todd, both from Ireland; Mr. Dodsworth, who is said to have begun his course in the study of prophecy, and the late Mr. Fronde, whose remains have been published by his friends, and who, perhaps, carried out his views farther than either of his associates.

There are, besides, many individuals, particularly the younger members of the University of Oxford, who have

been more or less affected by the movement. The sons of Mr. Wilberforce have been suspected of partiality to these views. The expressions of Mr. Oakeley, prefixed to his Whitehall Sermons, are supposed to indicate the sentiments of many others. "His view," he says, "has been developed, (so far as it can be said to be developed,) in his mind partly by study, partly by reflection, partly by conversation with one or two friends, inquirers like himself. Neither does he by any means wish to disclaim, (far otherwise,) the influence of the teaching and example of certain members of his own university, who have been, for some time past, actively engaged in calling the attention of the church in this nation to the theology of primitive times."

What has been the progress, and what is the present state of the new development? In answer to this question, we shall refer to the statements of witnesses of different schools and parties.

The Rev. Baden Powell, the distinguished professor of geometry at Oxford, who, in the opinion of his opponents, sees more of the difficulties of the controversy than all the other antagonists put together, remarks, in his "Tradition Unveiled," that however mistaken some of the notions, or exaggerated reports which prevail on the subject, "it is not the less certain that there does exist considerable ground for apprehension;" and "certainly an ample reason for making a close inquiry into the facts of the case." He thinks that it is clear, from published authorities, that opinions and views of theology of a very marked and peculiar kind, applying more especially to church authority and questions growing out of it, have been extensively adopted and strenuously upheld, and are daily gaining ground among a considerable and influential portion of the members, as well as ministers of the Established Church. The bishop of Chester, (Sumner,) in his charge to his clergy, speaks of a "subject which is daily assuming a more serious and alarming aspect, and threatens a revival of the worst evils of the Romish system. Under the specious pretence of deference to antiquity, and respect for primitive models, the foundations of the Protestant Church are undermined by men who dwell within her walls, and those who sit in the Reformers' seat are traducing the Reformation." On the other hand, the bishop of Oxford has virtually countenanced the Oxford writers, and in a

charge has exculpated them from all blame but that of possibly going somewhat too far on the right side.* The Rev. Edward Bickersteth speaks of the new view as having manifested itself "with the most rapid growth of the hot-bed of these evil days." Bishop Wilson of Calcutta has charged his clergy against it in his usual energetic manner. The author of Random Recollections of the Lords and Commons, not, perhaps, the best authority, writes that the Oxford doctrines are making rapid progress. One of the largest churches in Brighton is crowded every Sunday to hear those doctrines preached by the Rev. Mr. Anderson. "In fact there are few towns of note to which they have not extended. They are preached in small towns in Scotland. They obtain in Elginshire, which is 600 miles north of London." The writer goes on to say that they are advocated in the newspaper and periodical press. The Morning Post sustains the character of their apologist in London; and the Liverpool Mail, the Coventry Herald, and other journals identify themselves with them in the country. The British Critic and Quarterly Theological Review is earnestly engaged in the maintenance and spread of the Oxford views. As this is a work of ability, and is completely engrossed in its vocation, we may regard its character as an indication of the prevalence of the doctrines in question.†

---

* See the beginning of Dr. Pusey's letter.

† In the 25th volume of this work, there are 15 articles. The first article is on the British Association for the Advancement of Science; the second, on the Apostolical Fathers; the third, on Prussian Schools; the fourth, on Tyler's Memoirs of Henry of Monmouth; the fifth, on Early Ecclesiastical Art; the sixth, on the Jesuits; the seventh, on Plato; the eighth, on Reserve in communicating Religious Knowledge; the ninth, on Elliott's Travels in Europe; the tenth, on Church and King; the eleventh, on Church Architecture; the twelfth, on the State of Parties in the Church; the thirteenth, on Ecclesiastical Discipline; the fourteenth, on the Authority of Tradition; and the fifteenth, on Church Edifices. This abstract will show what subjects are now occupying a portion at least of the English mind. All these articles, however alien the titles of some of them may be from church matters, have one scope and one tendency.

The most powerful opponent of the Oxford school who has yet appeared, is Isaac Taylor, the well-known author of the Natural History of Enthusiasm, etc. His chief object, in his "Ancient Christianity," is to prove how widely and how early the unscriptural and demoralizing notion of the religious virtue of celibacy was propagated in the primitive church, and to trace to it most of the errors and evils which corrupted and afflicted it, and to prove their inseparable connection with the system adopted by the Oxford Tract writers. "The spread of these doctrines," remarks this vigorous writer, "is in fact now having the effect of rendering all other distinctions obsolete, and of severing the religious community into two portions, fundamentally and vehemently opposed one to the other. Soon there will be no middle ground left; and every man, and especially every clergyman, will be compelled to make his choice between the two."

What then are the doctrines of this school, which, in the view of those who are least alarmed, have made considerable progress?*

1. *It pays the highest veneration to the Church, and the most implicit obedience to her authority.* "Religion apart from the Church," it is contended, "has always been rather a stimulus than otherwise to pride, impatience, false independence and self-seeking. It makes man rather a more powerful, than a better being, morally speaking."† The following remarks of Bishop Pearson are quoted with approbation in the first number of the Tracts for the Times: "There is a necessity of believing the Catholic Church, because except a man be of that, he can be of none. Whatsoever church pretendeth to a new beginning, pretendeth at the same time to a new churchdom, and whatsoever is so new is none." Again (Tract No. 36): "The English Church, which is a true branch or portion of the 'one holy, catholic and apostolic Church' of Christ, receives and teaches the entire truth of God, according to the Scriptures; the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." "On the whole, (Tract 59,) there is evidently no security, no rest for the sole of

* We can give but a brief abstract of some of the more important points.

† British Critic, vol. XXV. p. 122.

one's foot, except in the form of sound words; the one definite system of doctrine, sanctioned by the one apostolical and primitive Church." And so we might multiply quotations of the same tenor without end. The transcendent importance, the divine authority of the Church are asserted and reasserted in every possibble form. Nothing can be done without her sanction. Irregularity or schism marks every independent and voluntary effort. Thus in an article against Temperance Societies: "We are already members of a temperance society divinely founded. It has a pledge, a public profession and rules; it has authority to warn, to punish, and, if need be, to exclude. Why need we belong to another? Why need we make one for ourselves?"

2. *Unbroken Apostolical Succession.* The following are specimens of the phraseology in Mr. Gladstone's book.* The civil ruler would prefer, to the Scottish Church, the polity of the English Church, which superadded to the evidence and guarantee of the word, of the sacraments, of creeds and of primitive practice, *a perpetual succession of clergy*, by whom these have been received, as they were delivered in regular order from hand to hand. The difference is twofold between the Church of England and any other; it is that between inheritance and acquisition; it is that between an attested and a conjectural authority from God. In England the Reformation did not destroy, but successfully maintained the unity and succession of the Church in her apostolical ministry. We have, therefore, still among us the ordained, hereditary witnesses of the truth, conveying it to us, through an unbroken series, from our Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles. The Oxford Tract (No. 2.) holds

* "The State in its Relations to the Church. By W. E. Gladstone, Esq., student of Christ Church, Oxford, and M. P. for Newark. London, 1839. 8vo." "In Mr. Gladstone, we have no village theorizer, no cloistered alarmist, but a public man, a man of the world, a statesman of the highest talent for business, an orator, who commands the ear of the House of Commons." *British Critic*, XXVI. *p.* 356. "There is an air of calmness and dignity in the principal part of his discussion which stands out in pointed contrast to the dogmatic, flippant and superficial style of most of his fellow-laborers in the same vocation." *Eclectic Review*, *April*, 1839.

the following unambiguous language: "As to the fact of the apostolical succession, i. e. that our present bishops are the heirs and representatives of the apostles by successive transmission of the prerogative of being so, this is too notorious to require proof. Every link in the chain is known from St. Peter to our present metropolitans." Dr. Hook, in his "Call to Union,"* supplies one of the inferences from this doctrine. "Hence it is, that while a minister of the Roman Church officiates among us, upon a renunciation of his errors, without a further ordination, a converted Presbyterian minister is unable to do so. The one has had, the other has not had, episcopal ordination." Dr. Hook refers for authority to the ordinal in which the point was settled, before the Thirty-nine Articles were received, and which affirms that it is evident to all men diligently reading the Scriptures and the ancient authors, that from the apostles' time, there have been these three orders of ministers in Christ's Church, bishops, priests and deacons. So the Church of England speaks of these offices as divinely instituted.

3. *Tradition.* With relation to the supreme authority of inspired Scripture, says Prof. Keble, it stands thus. Catholic tradition teaches revealed truth, Scripture proves it; Scripture is the document of faith, tradition the witness of it; the true creed is the catholic interpretation of Scripture, or scripturally proved tradition; Scripture by it itself teaches mediately, and proves decisively; Scripture and tradition taken separately together are the joint rule of faith. The term includes unwritten as well as written traditions, certain remains or fragments of the apostolical doctrines and church rules, independent of, and distinct from the truths which are directly scriptural. These traditions are to be received apart from all Scripture evidence, as traditionary or common laws ecclesiastical. It is right, however, to quote Mr. Palmer, in his "Treatise on the Church," who uses language less decided than that of Mr. Keble: "We do not appeal, in proof of Christian doctrine, to the ancient Christian writers as in any way *infallible*. We hold that the doctrine of any father, however great and learned he may have been, is to be *rejected* in any point where it contradicts Scripture. We consider all these writers as uninspired men, and there-

* Page 24, New-York Edition.

fore liable to mistakes and errors like other theologians." We will quote one testimony further: "The authority which we claim for the primitive Church, is wholly different from that claimed for the apostles, in this most important respect; that whereas the apostles and evangelists SINGLY were inspired by the Holy Ghost, and their separate authority, therefore, divine, we claim for the Church, even in its earliest and purest ages, no divine authority, except in its full and unexceptionable CONSENT." "We receive the holy Scriptures upon the plain historical ground of contemporary evidence; and in those Scriptures we find the promise which guarantees the infallibility of the Church when she really speaks in her complete and universal character." But where, we must ask, is this uniform and unexceptionable consent? Where is the promise which guarantees the infallibility of the Church? And how would this infallibility differ from that of the Romish pontiff?*

4. *System of Fasting.* Great stress is laid in the Oxford Tracts upon those practices which involve self-denial and mortification of the flesh. The following is from Tract 21, by Mr. Newman. "Consider, moreover, the *general austere character* of Christian obedience, as enjoined by our Lord; a circumstance much to be insisted on in an age like this, when what is really self-indulgence is thought to be a mere moderate and innocent use of this world's goods."† "Our reformers (Tract No. 18,) kept and enjoined one hundred and eight days in each year, either entirely or in

* The system, according to Prof. Powell, the able opponent of the doctrine of tradition, implies the addition of an authorized comment to the apostles' writings. Accordingly, the church and the fathers were as much the depositaries of one portion of Christian doctrine as the apostles and evangelists were of another. Consequently the evidence requisite to establish that authority must be precisely the same for both. Now the kind of evidence generally looked to is that derived from miracles. Has tradition the support of miracles?

† There is reason for injunctions of this kind, if a correspondent of the Christian Observer, Dec. 1839, testifies truly: "You have probably seen," he says to the editor, "the painful accounts of *clerical* attendance in bath-rooms. And it is a fact, that *many* clergymen do yet frequent such scenes; and this often during the season of *Lent*."

part, to be in this manner sanctified; two sevenths of each year they wished to be in some way separated by acts of self-denial and humiliation." In Tract No. 66, a series of rules is suggested in relation to fasting. One of these rules is, that in some cases the fast may be accompanied with little outward acts of self-denial, such as those which Jeremy Taylor instances, viz., hard lodging, uneasy garments, laborious postures of prayer, journeys on foot, sufferance of cold, paring away the use of ordinary solaces, rejecting the most pleasant morsels, etc.

5. *Celibacy.* Dr. Pusey, in his letter to the bishop of Oxford, says, that nowhere in the Tracts have there been put forth any recommendations of celibacy in general, or that of the clergy in particular; and that what has been elsewhere said by any who have written in the Tracts has been dropped incidentally. When it has been mentioned, it has been with reference to specific cases; as for example, Fronde remarks, that "great towns will never be evangelized merely by the parochial system; they are beyond the sphere of the parish priest, burdened as he is with the endearments and anxieties of a family." He says also, "that it has lately come into his head that the present state of things in England makes an opening for reviving the monastic system." Dr. Pusey remarks, that the "preference of celibacy, as the higher state, is scriptural, and as being such, is primitive." He also thinks that the English Church might have her *sisters of charity*, whose spotless and religious purity might be their passport amid the scenes of misery and loathsomeness.

6. *Rites and Forms.* Among the lesser ceremonies which have been adopted* by some of the Oxford school is, the turning of the minister *from* the people in public prayer; the use of the low desk instead of the second pulpit; bowing at the name of Jesus; the introduction of show-bread tables beside the sacrificial altar; the adoption of additional clerical habiliments; the use of the cross, of paintings, etc., in the churches.

7. *Prayers for the Dead.* This subject, also, Dr. Pusey

* Or rather, as Dr. Hook (Call to Union, p. 27) contends, *revived*, they having been, according to him, the usages of the English Reformers.

says, is mentioned incidentally by the writers of the Tracts, and that, in whatever degree it has been brought into notice, it has been through the diligence of their adversaries. He proceeds to remark, that "our Church regards all who depart hence in the Lord as in a state of yet imperfect happiness, and coincides with the prayers of the ancient Church, which speak of those departed as at rest, yet pray 'that God would show them mercy, and hasten the resurrection, and give a blessed sentence in the great day.'" "Those who condemn *all* prayers for Christ's departed servants, as popish, are doing Rome an honor which she little deserves, and making her out to be in this respect primitive, instead of the corrupter of primitive practice."

8. *General Tendency towards Romanism.* There seem to be some inconsistencies in different writers of the Oxford school on this subject. Thus the British Critic, vol. 26, p. 64: "The Roman Catholic Communion, whatever else it was or did, must be allowed this praise, that it was ever distinguished as the pillar of the truth. Its awful unity seems to have preserved it from the infidel temper of recent ages, as much as from the vast apostacies of the Eastern Church." Many other passages of a similar tenor might be cited. Dr. Pusey, in his letter to the bishop of Oxford, which is a mild and softened statement of the tenets and usages of the school, instances a number of points where the Anglican divines differ from Rome. Thus the English Church appeal to the authority of the Universal Church as long as it was one; Rome, to the Church ancient or modern, in communion with herself; the English, to the *consent* of the early church, however it be ascertained; Rome, to the decision of councils, confirmed by the bishop of Rome; in a word, the English divine seeks for a genuine apostolic tradition, to be established by the *consent* of all times, all churches, and the great doctors of all those churches; Rome, like ultra Protestants, follows modern traditions, assumes them to be apostolic, simply because she holds them, and she is infallible.

9. *The Union of the English Church to the State.* We should infer from the general current of the writings of the Oxford divines, that the continuance of this union is, on the whole, undesirable. Its dissolution is not, indeed, directly advocated. But no little effort is made to show that the English Church would still remain, in its substantial integri-

ty and glory, were the connection with the State sundered. The evils flowing from the interference of a secular power are mournfully and earnestly depicted. The following are some of the charges of the British Critic against the "Defender of the Faith." He is now bound to defend the kirk in Scotland, popery in the Canadas, and idolatry in India. None of the privileges and offices of the State are necessarily confined to churchmen. The whole of the Church property in Ireland, and great part in England, has been vested in a commission so constituted as to be entirely under the control of the crown. The property of the Church is no longer taxed by convocation. Church rates are abolished in Ireland, and are threatened in England. The right of the bishops to sit in the House of Lords, though not yet taken away, is reduced to half a quarter of what it was, the bishops not being now more numerous than in the reign of Henry VIII., while the temporal peers have been multiplied near eight times. Convocation is suspended and virtually suppressed, while the State is violently legislating for the Church. The management of the poor, and the public collection for them, is entirely taken out of the hands of the Church. The Episcopal right of licensing school-masters is now a dead letter. A universal system of education, without a religious creed, is forced on Ireland, and England is menaced with the same. The State maintains a popish college in that island, and contributes to dissenting schools in England on the same terms as to Church schools.

We have thus exhibited, as fully as our brief limits will allow, some of the more prominent features of the doctrines and practices advocated by the Oxford Theologians. In another paper we shall advert to other matters pertaining to the established Church, to the principal dissenting denominations, and conclude with some reflections growing out of the discussion.

ARTICLE IX.

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE JEWISH RELIGION.

By E. S. Calman, Missionary to the Jews in Palestine.

[*Concluded from Vol.* III. *page* 426.]

NEXT in order is *the Feast of Tabernacles*, commanded in Lev. 23: 39: "Also in the 15th day of the 7th month, when ye have gathered in the fruits of the land, ye shall keep a feast unto the Lord seven days." From several other passages it is evident that this feast should be kept at the close of the year, as Ex. 23: 16: "And the feast of harvest, the first fruits of thy labors which thou hast sown in thy field, and the feast of ingathering which is in the end of the year, when thou hast gathered in thy labors out of thy fields." And Ex. 34: 22: "And thou shalt observe the feast of weeks, etc., and the feast of ingathering at the year's end." From all these passages it is evident that the Talmudists have acted presumptuously in making the feast of Trumpets the new year, ראש השנה, consequently the poor Jews give it only this name, and thus the feast of Tabernacles comes at the beginning instead of the end of the year, as the Lord has commanded. The first two days are kept with decency and order, and next come the four days which are called חול המועד, the profane days of the festival, during which the merriment of שמחת בית השואבה, the commemoration of the joy of drawing water in the Temple is performed. The Jews everywhere celebrate this feast in the most sensual and corrupt manner. It originates of course from the Talmud, and may be found in Gamarah Sookouth, 48th page, where may also be found the chimerical and fanciful reason for it, and the manner of celebrating it. The following is a quotation from it:

ניסוך המים כצד צלוחית של זהב מחזקת שלושת לוגין הרה ממלא אותם ממי השילוח הגיעו לשער המרים תקעו והריעו ותקעו עלה בכבש ופנה לשמאלו ושני ספלין היו שם ומנוקבין כמין שני חוטמין דקין אחד מערבה ואחד דק כדי שיהיו שניהם כלין כאחד מערבית של מים ומזרחית של יין תני רבי יהודא בן בתירא אומר נאמר בשני ונסכיהם בשרש ונסכיה בשביעי כמשפטם מ״ם יו״ד מ״ם הרי כאן מיים מכאן רמז לניסוך המים המים מן התורה

"The pouring of the water (in the Temple) was performed thus: Golden cups, containing three logs, were filled with the water of Shiloah, and when the bearers of them reached the water gate (of the Temple) they blew with trumpets and shouted, proceeding in that manner until they ascended the altar, from whence they turned to the left, where were placed two silver dishes, each having a fine outlet. Into that of the west water was poured, and into that of the east, wine; and they were left leaking. Rabbi Yehoodah, the son of Bethairo, saith, in the offering of the second day, (of the Tabernacles,) the paragraph ends in a (מ) ונסכיהם "and their drink offerings," Num. 29: 19. And the paragraph belonging to the offering of the sixth day ends in a (י) ונסכיה (the Rabbi dislikes the final ה for it suits not his fancy). "This drink offering," v. 31. And the paragraph of the seventh day ends with a (מ) כמשפטם "after the manner," v. 33. And by putting together the three final letters is formed the word מים which means water; from hence we may infer that the law indicates the duty of pouring water at this feast. In the same volume we find the joy of that occasion summed up in the following words: תגו רבנן מי שלאראה שמחת בית השואבה לא ראה שימחה מימיו. "The Rabbies have taught, that whosoever has not witnessed the joy of the celebration of בית השואבה, Baith Hashowavah, cannot form any opinion of what joy is or ought to be." As the Rabbinical Jews try to imitate every thing which is Talmudical, they of course try to imitate this joy also through the aid of brandy and spirits. The memorial of that ceremony is celebrated by the Jews everywhere without distinction. It begins at the close of the second day of the feast of Tabernacles, and all the respectable people of each congregation are invited to come together at the synagogues, while the poorer classes assemble of their own accord. The synagogues are provided with an abundance of intoxicating drinks, of which all partake as freely as they please, and those who cannot bear strong drink are compelled to take it. Select pieces of poetry, which were used on the day of atonement, are read; the honor of reading them is sold by auction, and a part of the money thus raised is employed in the purchase of the brandy and spirits. When the purchaser of this honor commences his task of reading or chanting, he is joined by the whole assembly, and those who are

already inebriated continue their boisterous sounds, until laughter and confusion pervade the whole assembly. This scene is protracted for several hours, when voluntary and forced drinking assumes new earnestness and continues till near morning. I have seldom seen any one return sober from one of these occasions. This revelry is repeated for four successive nights, and many continue their attendance during the whole of the time day and night. The consequences of intemperance like this, needs no comment. As intoxication is rarely known to exist among the Jews on other occasions than festivals, they are rendered quite mad by this indulgence, destroying every thing without regard to whom it may belong.

The fifth evening of חול המועד, i. e. the profane days of the feast, and the following day, are called הושענה רבה, Hoosynno Rabbo. The Zohar asserts that the destinies which were assigned and recorded at the feasts of the New Year and sealed on the day of atonement, are on this evening distributed, and all therefore must again assemble at the synagogue and remain there until they have read through a volume of some size called תיקון ליל הושענה רבה. It contains the whole of Deuteronomy, and much of the Zohar, after which they go through with the Psalms. The encouragements held out to them to finish this heavy task are the same as on the night of the day of Pentecost, and the consequences are the same. After this they must repair to their baths, and dip their bodies three times in a pond of water which is under ground, and which every Jewish bath should be furnished with, and he must descend without a light, for the Zohar, or another Rabbinical book, asserts that those whose fate it is to die during that year will see their shadow having no head. The morning prayer begins very early, which is the common form, adapted to the music which is used on the day of atonement. They rehearse a good deal of poetry which is called הושענות from which the day takes its name.

On the following evening commence the two last days of the feast, called שמיני עצרת, and mentioned in Lev. 23: 36. The first day is kept in a sober manner, though quarrels take place on that day, especially among the Polish and Russian Jews. The reason of this is the following. A certain society called חברא קדישא the holy society, which has the management of the burial grounds, and whose business it is to visit the sick and bury the dead, has in the

person of their president the management of the synagogue for this single day, and those who are not of that society, dare not interfere with them, or give a disrespectful word in return for any insults which they may receive from them, lest fighting should ensue. These disorders are not always confined to the lower classes, and the congregations are obliged to apply to the mayor of the town for guards. On the following evening and the next morning, a procession is formed for the purpose of carrying the parchment rolls of the law seven times around the pulpit, which is called הקפות compassing about. The managers call the names of the party who carry the first rolls, and when they have finished, the second, and so on to the seventh. The managers use all their efforts to include every one present in these honorable processions, but the parchment rolls not being numerous, many are omitted, who, feeling themselves injured, and becoming indignant towards the managers, break forth in the most violent language, and thus is laid the foundation of future animosity and hatred. The second day is called both שמיני עצרת, and שמחת תורה, which means the joy of the law, for the reading of it is finished and begun again at the same time. After the above processions, which occur in the morning, all the rolls except two are placed again in the ark. These two are taken to the pulpit for the purpose of finishing and beginning the law. Every individual must be called up to pronounce a blessing; the portion for this occasion is from the 33d Deut. to the end of the roll, and the first chap. Gen., a portion of which is read by the chanter for each one who is called up to read. The former part of the law is read over again and again, two or three verses for each person, and none must be omitted. Even children of four or five years of age are called up, whose fathers carry them, and pronounce the blessing for them. In Poland and Russia it is the custom to serve every one called up with a piece of cake and a glass of brandy, but in the Holy Land the cake only is given and the brandy reserved until after the prayer, and great numbers become intoxicated in the synagogue.

Last year, on my way from Damascus to Jerusalem, I spent two days of the above feast at Safed. Indisposition of body prevented my attending the synagogue on the first day, but on the morning of the second day I attended the synagogue of the Parusim. Order and devo-

tion prevailed during the whole of the service. I was also called up to pronounce a blessing and read some portion of the law. I saw no brandy, but cake was distributed, and as soon as I had done reading, a large piece of cake was presented to me, as well as to all the others. As soon as the service was closed the brandy appeared, of which I wholly declined partaking. As the drinking assumed a serious aspect, I thought it best to retire to my lodgings, where one arrived soon after so intoxicated that after a little exertion in jumping about the room, he fell senseless upon the floor. His poor wife administered to him, pouring cold water upon him occasionally, until at last they conveyed him to the roof of the house, where he lay a whole day insensible, and his wife guarding him. But my host, with whom I had a conversation previously on the impropriety of getting drunk for God's sake, came home sober. Soon after his return a large company of intoxicated persons came in singing and dancing. Brandy and sweetmeats were placed upon the table according to custom, and I was invited to join them in their dinner, which I did. Finding the company were filling up the measure of their intoxication, I availed myself of the opportunity of expostulating with them upon the unlawfulness of intoxication at any time, especially during the days which the Lord has consecrated to be kept holy unto himself, and that instead of obtaining heaven they would incur the punishment of hell. My host being the only sober one among them, began to defend their practice by referring to Deut. 16: 14, "And thou shalt rejoice in thy feast, thou and thy son," etc., and he inquired, "How can we rejoice when our circumstances are so unhappy, except by the use of intoxicating liquor, which enables us to forget all our sorrows and be merry?" I replied, that this proves our nation to have lost all sensibility to spiritual things, and all love to God, and that this can only result from a knowledge of a crucified Saviour. I furthermore asked him what necessity there was for him to be excited by love of the world, and to rejoice in the possession of its good things? He acknowledged that it was wrong, and promised not to drink that day. The visiters left, dissatisfied and weary with my presence. My host was soon after called away, and as I accidentally passed the house of their chief Rabbi, I recognised his voice among the singers.

In passing another street I met two respectable Jewish boys disputing with each other concerning the Rabbi whom they should join to perform the duty of the day. One said, "let us go to this Rabbi," and the other said, "no, let us go to that." I was struck with the eagerness with which they discussed the matter, and with their enumeration of the advantages which they would derive from the one or the other. I could not help thinking that such youths would never have thought of these allurements, had not their parents or teachers inculcated it as a religious duty, and thus caused them to be entangled in sensuality from their tenderest years, which renders them careless of and unsusceptible to spiritual things. After leaving them I proceeded to the native Jewish Synagogue, where I found a great number of boys from 8 to 12 years of age, running around the pulpit with the parchment rolls of the law in their arms, some of them larger than the bearers themselves. Though it was already dusk, they still continued their frolic, attended with great noise. It was sickening to behold such levity in the house of God, and by those who held his law in their arms. One man was present to see that they did not let the rolls fall, as in this case the whole congregation would be obliged to expiate the offence by a fast of one or two days. This merriment seldom closes with the day, but continues in some places through the week.

In the previous year, 1833, I was at Bagdad, where I made frequent attempts to attend the Synagogue, but did not succeed in consequence of the guard which was placed there by the Pasha, by the express desire of the Prince of the captivity, probably to prevent disturbance. This year I attended the Synagogue in Beyroot. As I entered when the first part of the service was over, I can only relate what I saw during the reading of the Law, and the procession for carrying it around the pulpit, which was sufficiently distressing. When particular individuals were called up to pronounce a blessing and read particular portions of the law, comfits were thrown, for the honor, over the whole assembly, and all the boys, and many grown persons, tumbled over one another to pick them up, which gave the synagogue the aspect of a mad-house, rather than of a house of prayer. After this, those who stood in the pulpit, and many others, proceeded with a chorus, singing and dancing, to fetch those to the pulpit for whose honor they had scattered

the sweetmeats, while at the same time others ran to and fro, sprinkling everybody in the assembly with rose-water. The procession of the law was accompanied with the same degree of levity, except that no sweetmeats were distributed. On asking the reason of these last, I was told it was to set forth the *sweetness* of the law!

Next comes *the Feast of Dedication*, mentioned in the New Testament. It is a common practice to gamble or play cards during the whole week, which originated in a fabulous legend, found in some Rabbinical books, as follows:—When Antiochus, the king of Syria, conquered the land of Israel, he issued a law against the reading or studying of the written and oral laws. However, the Jews assembled for this purpose, and to shield themselves from detection, brought with them cards and other instruments for gaming, which they produced before the police as the reason for assembling in such numbers. This artifice was successful, and they pursued their reading and study of the law with impunity, and thus gambling has become identified with this feast. For the eve of Christmas they have another legend for playing and gambling, but it is only confined to schoolboys and students. The evil consequences of connecting intemperance and gambling with religious ceremonies, can easily be imagined, as it opens a door for licentiousness, which, though at first confined to particular occasions, does not stop there. Now, cards begin to be used for an amusement as soon as the feast of tabernacles is over, which is eight weeks previous to the abovementioned feast, and it continues eight weeks after. Intemperance, also, has found its way to every religious ceremony, as circumcision, marriages, dedications of houses and synagogues, consecration of parchment rolls of the law, finishing the reading of the Talmud or Mishna, etc., etc. I am sure no greater blindness can happen to a people, than that they should be left to introduce such abominations into the service of God. The prophet Isaiah expresses it all in a single sentence, "The Lord abhors robbery for a burnt-offering."

Next in order is *the Feast of* פוּרִים *Esther*, which occurs generally either in the latter part of February or in the beginning of March; when it is enjoined by the Talmud that every one should become so intoxicated as to lose his reason. This injunction is found in the Gammarah Migilla,

מגילה, page 6, as follows: חייב אדם לבסומי בפוריא עד דלא ידע בין ברוך מרדכי לארור המן "Every man is under an obligation to get so drunk that he cannot distinguish between the phrases *blessed be Mordecai and cursed be Haman.*" This command is literally obeyed everywhere from the east to the west.

The keeping of *the Sabbath* has also undergone a great change through the influence of the Talmud, though they have not changed its time, as they have that of the festivals. Still the reason for sanctifying it is no longer grounded upon the command of God only. A plausible one has been given by the Talmud, as if that which God has given were not sufficient. Thus the Talmud explains it in Gammarah Sabbath, page 118:

אמר רבי יוחנן כל המשמר שבת כהלכתו אפילו עובד ע"ז כאנוש מוחלין לו שנאמר אשרי אנוש יעשה זאת ובן אדם יחזיק בה שומר שבת מחללו אל תקרי מחללו אלא מחול לו

"Rabbi Yechonon saith: Whosoever observes the Sabbath rightly, though he be an idol-worshipper as Enos was, will be forgiven, for it is written, Isaiah 56: 2, Blessed is the man אֱנוֹשׁ *Enos* that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it, that keepeth the Sabbath from pollution מחללו." But we must not read it as it is written, but מחול לו, which means it will be forgiven him, (viz. a sin like that of אנוש Enos,) which the Talmudists take to be idolatry. They suppose that Enos was the first who invented the worship of strange gods. This they infer from Gen. 4: 26, "And to Seth, to him also there was born a son, and he called his name Enos: then began men, הוחל as they render it, to *profane*, namely, he taught men to profane the name of God, by introducing idols. The same is taught in the Sabbath hymns, which is of course believed by all who wonder after the Talmud. The evil of this is very great, since it not only inspires them with a false hope of obtaining pardon in a way which God has not appointed, but it frustrates also the object for which the Lord intended that the day should be hallowed. The directions in the Talmud respecting the manner in which the Sabbath should be kept are quite contrary to those in Isaiah 58: 13. The former recommends that it be observed by eating and sleeping, and they have ingeniously introduced it in the following words:

אמר רבי שמעון כל המקיים שלוש סעודות בשבת ניצל משלוש פורענויות מחבלו של משיח ומדינא של גהינם וממלחמות גוג ומגוג

"Rabbi Simeon saith: Whosoever discharges the duty of eating three meals on the Sabbath will be delivered from three calamities. First, from the pain which will befall (the world) at the coming of the Messiah; second, from the condemnation of Gehennem or Purgatory; third, from the war of Gog and Magog." Gammarah Sabbath, page 118. Another enjoyment imposed upon them is to sleep some part of the day, as follows: שינה בשבת עונג, "Sleep on the Sabbath is a *delight*," and is therefore that to which the prophet Isaiah refers when he says, "And call the Sabbath a delight." A third is מטה ביוצאת ואשת מקושטת לתלמוד חכם, Gammarah Sabbath, p. 25, which propriety forbids me to translate. The prayers of the Sabbath are as usual signalized by a want of devotion and solemnity. After the first part of שחרית "the morning prayer" has closed, an auction takes place, again also in the afternoon, when the reading of the law is sold to the highest bidder. The same is true on every festival. On these occasions great ambition is exhibited, particularly when the parties are at enmity with each other. The money belongs, of course, to the synagogue. Another great evil attending the Sabbath is the following. In Europe travelling chanters are very common, and bands of ten or more are often kept for weeks together at a great expense for the purpose of chanting the Sabbath prayers. Large sums are also paid to the chanters themselves, for the collecting of which the managers station guards at the door of the synagogue, and every one who cannot produce a ticket is forbidden to enter, and of course is deprived of the privileges of public worship. Thus the synagogue in all respects assumes the character of a theatre. The remainder of the day is spent in reading the Talmud, and other Rabbinical books by the educated, and in amusements by the uneducated. It is also allowable on that day to make agreements with teachers, and to form matrimonial engagements.

I would now speak respecting the *character of their prayers.* These are offered three times in the day, morning, afternoon, and evening. The first is performed with the phylacteries תפילין upon their heads and left arms, and the veil over their heads. The essential part of the prayer is called קריאת שמע, consisting of several portions of Scripture, viz. from the 4th to the 10th verse of the 6th Deut., from

13th to the 22d of 11th, and from 32d to 36th of 15th Numbers, and these portions of Scripture they peruse in their evening prayers, and by so doing they are led to believe that they have discharged the duty or fulfilled the command in Deut. 6: 7, "And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them, etc., when thou liest down, and when thou risest up;" and the remainder part of the day is set apart for reading and studying the corrupt Talmud; and though the whole prayer is much longer, they have done their duty by perusing the above quotations. No solemnity characterizes their devotions. Some turn their faces to the east, some to the west, except during certain portions of the prayer, when all turn their faces to the east. Some read books, and some talk about their business. Much of this evil originates from their not understanding what they pray, but it is a form that never changes, and which they learn by heart from childhood, and it therefore makes no impression upon their minds; and much of it, too, is to be attributed to the Talmud; first, for having prescribed a form of prayer never to be changed, and next for prohibiting its use in any other language but the Hebrew. It affirms that the angels who are appointed by God to receive prayers cannot understand any other language. This arbitrary assertion is found in Gammarah Sabbath, page 12, as follows:

אמר רבי יוחנן ׳ כל השואל צרכיו בלשון ארמי אין מלאכי השרת נזקקין לו שאין מלאכי השרת מבררין בלשון ארמי

"Rabbi Yokhannan saith: Whosoever presents his wants (before God) in the Syrian tongue, (that is, in any language but the Hebrew,) the ministering angels (who are supposed to be mediators for them with God) will not be subject to them, for they understand not the language of Syria." The Talmudists go so far as to say, that the duty of prayer is done even if one's own ears do not hear what the mouth utters. This assertion is found in Gammarah Brokhouth, 2d section: הקורא את שמע ילא השמיע לאזנו יצא "If one reads Shma, (i. e. the essential part of the prayer which is taken from the five books of Moses,) and does not cause his ear to hear, (i. e. what the mouth utters,) has done his duty." Therefore it is very common to see them praying and working at the same time. It is related of a celebrated Rabbi of the Khasidim, named Rabbi Itchkhok Levi, of

Barditsov, that, meeting with some persons who were tarring their wagons when praying, and at the same time having their phylacteries upon their heads, instead of rebuking them, he commended them, by lifting up his eyes towards heaven and exclaiming, "Oh Lord God, what a dear and righteous people thy people Israel are, for they pray to thee even while they are tarring their wagons!" Surely that great Rabbi overlooked the words of the prophet in Isaiah 29: 13.

Education among the Jews is confined to the male sex, and prohibited by the Talmud for females, in the following words in Gammarah סוטה Souta, כל המלמד את בתו תורה כאילו מלמדה תפלות "Whoever instructs his daughter in the Bible it is as if he instructed her in abominations." Consequently the Jews in Poland, Russia and the East, never allow their daughters to be taught, nor do they allow them to go to the synagogue until they are married. They are not then permitted to enter the men's apartment of the synagogue, but they have a separate room assigned to them, where they spend the hours of prayer in talking about their household affairs.

The mode of education, as prescribed in the Talmud for the male sex, is sufficient to show that the Talmud is a very corrupt book, and the poor Jews very blind to follow it. According to its laws, all instruction from the Bible must be finished when a boy has reached the age of ten years, and the remainder of his education must be derived from the Mishna and the Talmud. The Jews at the present day go still farther, withdrawing their children from the Bible at the age of seven or eight, that is, as soon as a boy's mind is capable of understanding the Talmud. This injunction is found in פרקי אבות Pirkey Obooth, as follows: בן חמש למקרא ׳ בן עשרה למשנה ׳ בן חמש עשרה לגמרא "A child of five years old should be instructed in the Bible, of ten years in the Mishna, of fifteen in the Gammarah. In the Gammarah Brokhouth, page 27, a narrative is introduced for the purpose of alienating the minds of its followers from the written word of God, from which the following is a quotation. :

תנו רבנן כשחלה רבי אליעזר ניכנסו תלמידיו לבקרו אמרו לו רבי למדינו אורחות חיים ונזכה לחיי עולם הבא אמרלהם הזהרו בכבוד חבריכם וכ׳ ומנעו בניכם מהחגיון (פירוש ר״ש שלא תרגילים במקרא יותר מדאי משום דמשכא אחריהם) ובשביל כך תזכו לחיי עולם הבא

"The Rabbies have taught, that when Rabbi Eliezer was

ill, his disciples came to visit him, and said to him, Rabbi, teach us the way of life, and that by it we may obtain the life of the future world. He answered them, 'Take care of the honor of your fellows, etc., and prevent your children from reading the word of God too much, lest they should be carried away after it, and by this you will obtain the life of the future world." In the בי Gammarah Baba Meichca, (בבא מציאע) page 33, are stated some of the duties which a scholar owes to him who taught him the Talmud, but not to one who taught him only the Bible. The directions are lengthy, and I shall only make a short quotation as a specimen of the whole. Mishna, the text, begins thus: אבדת אביו ואבדת רבו של רבו קודם וכ׳ which will require a few words of explanation before the translation can be rendered intelligible. It is concerning the following occurrence. If a school-boy has found two articles at the same time, one of which belongs to his father and the other to his teacher, and he can only secure one of them, according to the text he ought to secure that which belongs to his teacher, and leave that which belongs to his father, etc. Then comes the Gammarah, the explanation of it, in the following words: תנו רבנן רבו שאמרו רבו שלמדו חכמה ולא רבו שלמדו מקרא או משנה "The Rabbies have taught that the name teacher which is mentioned, (in the text, who has privileges above a father,) has reference only to a teacher who taught his pupil Wisdom (i. e. the Talmud,) but not to one who taught Mikra, (i. e. the Bible,) and Mishna (which is the texts of the Talmud). They proceed to undervalue the word of God still farther, by asserting that no reward is granted by God for the perusal of his word, but there is for reading the Mishna and the Talmud. The following contains this pernicious sentiment:

תנו רבנן העוסקים במקרא מידה ואינה מידה במשנה מידה ונוטל עליה שכר בתלמוד אין לך מידה גדולה מזו

"The Rabbies have taught that those who resolve to occupy themselves in reading the Bible form neither a (good) measure nor a (bad) measure, and those who resolve to read the Mishna form a (good) measure, and receive (i. e. from God) for it, but those who resolve to read the Talmud cannot form a (better) measure!" In the ערובין Gammarah Erubin, page 21, we find the following comment to the same

effect upon Eccles. 12: 12, in which they assert that King Solomon meant thus:

בני הזהר בדברי סופרים יותר מדברי תורה שהלכו בדברי תורה יש בהן עשה ולא תעשה והלכו בדברי סופרים כל העובר עליהן חייב מיתה שמא תאמר אם יש בהן ממש מפני מה לא נכתבו אמר קרא עשות ספרים הרבה וכ׳

"My son, take heed to what the scribes have said more than to what is written in the Taura, (Bible or Law,) for those (commandments) written in the law are only of a positive and negative (nature,) but those of the scribes (are of such a nature) that if one has broken them he incurs the penalty of death. And if thou sayest, if they (i. e. the precepts of the scribes) are of such importance, why were they not written (that is by Moses)? it is because the Preacher said, 'of making many books there is no end,'" etc. The Talmudists place those who are instructed only in the Mishna, מקרא Bible, under the class of עם הארצים peasantry according to the assertion found in the Gammarah Brokhouth, page 47, and Gammarah סוטה Souta, page 21; that therefore they ought to be treated with that contempt which we find laid down respecting them in the Gammarah פסחים Psokhim, page 49. The following quotation from it will show what contempt the Talmudists throw upon the above class:

תנו רבין לעולם ימסור אדם מה שיש לו וישא בת תלמוד חכם וכו׳ ולא ישא בת עם הארץ מפני שהם שקץ ונשותיהם שרץ ועל בנותיהם הוא אומר ארור שוכב עם כל בהמה׳

"The Rabbies have taught, Let every one sell all which he possesses for the sake of marrying the daughter of a Talmudical wise man, etc., but let him not marry the daughter of a עם הארץ peasant, for they are an abomination, and their wives are reptiles, and respecting their daughters he has said (i. e. God or Moses) in Deut. 27: 21, Cursed be he that lieth with any manner of beast." A similar prohibition extends to the giving of a daughter in marriage to עם הארץ a peasant, which is expressed in the following words רבי מאיר אומר כל המשיא ביתו לעם הארץ כאלו כופתה וניתנה לפני אריה וכ׳

"Rabbi Mayor saith, Whosoever giveth his daughter in marriage to עם הארץ is as if he bound her and threw her before a lion." It is very seldom that marriages take place contrary to the impositions of the Talmudists; or if they do, such marriages are seldom happy ones, as the party which be-

longs to the Talmudical class regards the other with great contempt, and generally after a few years of bitterness and contention a divorce takes place. The Jewish children in Poland and Russia, and to some extent in the East, are taught from their infancy to praise and honor those who are acquainted with the Talmud, and to despise and contemn those who are ignorant of it. It is not strange, therefore, that the generality of the Jews in these parts should be ignorant of the word of God. When I was in Beyroot the first time, and, in conversation with the chief Rabbi of the congregation, quoted from my Bible the 26th verse of 7th Daniel, he was surprised at the striking passage which I read to him in favor of Christianity, and was so confident that such an one could not be found in their Bibles that he exclaimed before all present that my Bible was a spurious one, which was the work of Christians in England, for the purpose of supporting their own religion; and added, that if so clear a prophecy could be found in their own Bibles, he would instantly embrace Christianity. He accordingly sent immediately for his own Bible, and was quite confounded to discover that it contained the same as mine. The Jews everywhere furnish every facility for those who study the Talmud, but take no cognizance of those who confine themselves to the word of God. Many ישיבות colleges are found in the abovementioned countries, and particularly in the Holy Land, supported either by individuals or by the community, for educating persons in the Talmud, but not one is found for studying the word of God. The commentaries also have rendered the Bible unintelligible and ambiguous by giving it a different meaning from what God intended, and thus unfit to furnish instruction; so that those who are proficients in the Talmud are not so in the Bible, particularly in the important prophecies which relate to Christ; but the more they pervert them, the more mysterious they make them. They allow not their children to be instructed either in the grammar of the language where they sojourn, or in the Hebrew, which renders them quite incapable of judging for themselves in regard to the meaning of the Bible, and this obliges them to consult the commentary for the interpretation of every sentence. The reason why all the Jews who wonder after the Talmud are so averse to the study of the above branch of learning, and to

have their children instructed in it, is, that the frauds and perversions of the Talmud and the commentaries may not be detected. An ascendency is gained over such as do not understand grammar, but if this be attained, an abhorrence of such impositions cannot but ensue. I shall produce two examples of the many violations of grammar which are found in the subtle Talmud, to show the snares in which the minds of the poor Jews are caught. The first is found in ברכות Gammarah Brokhouth, page 7th, in the following sentence :

אמר רבי יוחנן מניין שהקדוש ברוך הוא מתפלל ׳ שנאמר והבריאותם אל הר קדשי ושמחתם בבית תפילתי ״ תפילתם לא נאמר אלא בבית תפילתי מלמד שהקדש ברוך הוא מצלי

It would be difficult for me to give an intelligible translation of this until I have stated the grammatical rule. When a noun in the genitive is employed to qualify a preceding noun, the suffix pronoun, though it belongs to the first noun, is usually put after the second, as in Dan. 9: 24, עִיר קָדְשֶׁךָ, Thy holy city ; literally the city of thy holiness. Isaiah 2: 20 אלילי כספו, his silver idols, literally the idols of his silver. The Talmud, in the above quotation, asserts that God himself offers prayers. To prove this absurdity, or more properly blasphemy, they violate the above rule of grammar in the 7th verse of 56th Isaiah. "Even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful *in my house of prayer*," בבית תפילתי which they render *the house of my prayer*, viz., where I pray, (i. e. God himself,) but according to the grammatical rule the suffix (י) of תפילתי belongs to the preceding noun בית, as I have illustrated above. The second example is found in the Gammarah Megilla מגילה, where they wish to prove that the book of Esther was written by the dictates of the Holy Spirit, and they make the following criticism :

מניין שמגילת אסתר ברוח הקדש נאמרה שנאמר וימי הפורים האלה לא יעברו מתוך היהודים ״ ואם לא נכתבה ברוח הקדש מנין הוידעו שלא יעברו

" How can we prove that the book of Esther was written by the dictates of the Holy Spirit? Because it is written in the 9th chap. 28th ver. ' And that these days of Purim *will not* (Heb. *should* not) fail from among the Jews,' therefore if that book was not written by the Holy Spirit how could the writer know that this feast of Purim *will not pass from*

them?" But this criticism can hold good only with those who are ignorant of the most common rules of grammar, for the words ought to be translated imperatively as in the English: "These days of Purim *should not fail*, but not prophetically *will not fail*, as the Talmudists will have it to be. The imperative in the Hebrew is never used with the negative, but when a negative imperative is wanted the adverb לא is prefixed to the future, as in Ex. 20: 15. "Steal not," literally, thou wilt not steal. How strikingly is fulfilled the prophecy of Amos, among the Jews at the present time, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the word of God."

Another practice is imposed by the Talmud; that of performing once a month something like obeisance to the moon. I will first quote the words of the Talmud respecting it, and then describe the ceremony, and leave each one to form his own opinion. In the סנהדרין Gammarah Sanhedrim, page 42, are the following words:

אמר רב אחא כל המברך על החדש בזמנו כאילו מקבל פני השכינה ׳ כתיב הבא החדש הזה ׳ וכתיב התם זה אלי ואנוהו ׳ תנא דבי רבי ישמעאל אלמלא לא זכו ישראל אלא להקביל פני אביהם שבשמים פעם אחת בחודש היה דיין׳ אמר אביי הלכך צריך לנמרינהו מעומד:

"Rabbi Akha said, Whoever pronounces a blessing upon the new moon, (which the Talmudists call חדש, i. e. new,) in its due season, (that is from the fourth or fifth day of her appearance until she is full,) is as meritorious as if he had received the presence of פני השכינה the Shekinah;" for with the *moon* we find the expression זה *this*, Ex. 12: 2, החדש הזה לכם, "This month (or as they translate it, this new moon) "shall be unto you," etc., *and with* שכינה the Shekinah we find also the expression זה *this*, Ex. 15: 2, זה אלי ואנוהו, "This is my God, and I will make him a habitation." The disciples of Rabbi Isurael have taught, 'If Israel had not obtained any other merit than that of receiving the presence of their heavenly Father only once a month it would be sufficient, therefore we ought to pronounce the blessing (i. e. upon the moon) in an erect posture.' Their ritual or code of laws requires the performance of this ceremony at the close of the Saturday evening service, in order that the whole congregation, when they leave the synagogue, may go through it at once. The first reason assigned for this is, that "in the

multitude of people is the king's honor," Prov. 14: 28; and the second, that the blessing of the moon should be pronounced in the adorned apparel of the Sabbath. The ceremony is performed as follows. On Saturday evening after prayer the whole congregation repair to the enclosure of the synagogue, when their eyes are immediately turned towards the heavens to see if the moon is not obscured by clouds, if so they must wait till the clouds have passed away from it; or if it continues obscured they must wait for another opportunity, since the blessing must not be pronounced until the face of the moon is perfectly bright. As the whole blessing is too long for insertion here, I will only give a part of it:

1 ברוך יוצרך ברוך עושך ברוך קונך ברוך בוראך׳ וכו׳ 2 כשם שאני רוקד כְּנֶגְדֵּךְ ואין יכולתי לנגוע בָּךְ כך לא יוכלו כל אויבי לנגוע בי לרעה 3 תפול עליהם אימתה ופחד בגדול זרועך ידמו כאבן 4 דוד מלך ישראל חי וקיים׳ 5 שלום עליכם עליכם שלום׳ 6 סימן טוב ומזל טוב יהיא לנו ולכל ישראל אמן

1. "Blessed is thy former, blessed is thy maker, blessed is thy possessor, blessed is thy creator." (Thus far the address is to God. The next is to the moon, for the suffixes are feminine, agreeing with לבנה *moon*.) 2. "Inasmuch as I cannot reach thee or touch thee in my jumping towards thee, (i. e. the moon, and they jump accordingly three times,) so likewise my enemies shall not be able to reach me, to do me evil." Then again they address God. 3. "Fear and dread shall fall upon them by the greatness of thine arm, they shall be as still as a stone." 4. "David the king of Israel liveth and is in existence." 5. "Peace be unto you, unto you be peace." 6. "A good sign or omen, and good luck shall be unto us and to all Israel. Amen." The above sentences are repeated thrice. Next they repeat the above quotation of the disciples of Rabbi Isurael. When all is over, a shaking of garments takes place, by which they believe that the evil spirits which adhered to them drop from them, and this closes the ceremony.

The Talmudists have the most extraordinary and even blasphemous ideas concerning the moon, and do not hesitate to blaspheme God on account of it. They suppose that God created the sun and moon of equal size, but diminished the latter after she demonstrated to her Creator the impropriety of creating two rulers equal in strength and magnitude.

This strange idea they take from Gen. 1: 16, where God calls both the sun and the moon great; but as in the latter clause of the verse he calls the moon the lesser light, they make this blasphemous assertion; that God repented of having diminished the moon, and therefore asked the children of Israel to expiate *his* sin, by offering a sin-offering for *him*. This abomination is found in שבועות Gammarah Shebouth, page 9, as follows:

אמר ריש לקיש מה נשתנה שעיר של ראש חודש שנאמר בו ליהוה אמר יהוה שעיר זה יהא כפרה עלי שמיעטתי את הירח

"Rashlokish said, What is the reason that the words ליהוה (for Jehovah) are used at the offering of the kid at the new moon?" Num. 28: 15. 'And one kid of the goats for a sin-offering,' ליהוה *for the Lord*, (as they explain it,) which is not found at any other offerings, for *he* said, Let this kid be an atonement for me for having diminished the moon." I cannot but think that the Talmudists must have been possessed with unclean spirits, to have written and taught such abominations, and the fact that the Jews believe implicitly word for word their assertions, fully demonstrates their spiritual blindness.

In one respect the Jews in the Holy Land are far worse than those in Russia, Poland and Turkey, inasmuch as they are much attached to the practice of praying to deceased saints and relics. The veneration which they have for the supposed stones of the temple is beyond description. They never venture to approach them with their shoes upon their feet; prayers are offered before them on every Friday, and many of them are actually worn from kissing. Praying to the dead is unlimited both by time and place. Every spot is frequented where are supposed to be buried saints, whose names are found either in the Mishna, the Talmud, or the Bible. An annual resort for this purpose is at Safed, at the grave of Rabbi Simeon Ben Yekhoiah, the author of the Zohar, which closes with a drinking festival, that lasts about three days, the particulars of which I have given you in a former letter. When I passed through Tiberias on my way to Jerusalem, I met outside of the gate a poor old woman, bearing a small pitcher in one hand and a lamp with oil in the other, and proceeding towards the declivities of the hills, where are the caves of Rabbi Akiba, (who distinguished himself as armor-bearer to the false Messiah Bar Kakaba,)

and of Rabbi Mayer Baal Ness, רבי מאיר בעל נס, which means the lord of miracles. It is believed by all, that if any one meets with a misfortune, he will be set free from it by promising any sum of money to the latter deceased Rabbi. The income amounts to immense sums, a part of which is expended in burning oil at his cave day and night, and in the respective synagogues of the Holy Land, and the remainder the living Rabbies keep for their own use.

I met also many persons returning from the performance of these devotions. How truly applicable to the present state and practices of the Jews is the 2d verse of the 55th chapter of Isaiah!

Last winter, Mr. Nicholayson and myself and many others visited a cave on the summit of Mount Olivet, where the prophetess Huldah is supposed to be buried. It is joined to a Mosque. In the cave are two large oblong stones, placed one upon the other, something in the form of a sepulchre. There we found several Spanish Jews, barefooted, with their faces turned toward the blocks, and praying very earnestly, though the day was very wet and cold, and the cave, as I have said, on the very summit of the mount, requiring an exhausting effort to reach it. The following fact will show the eagerness of the poor Jews in the Holy Land in praying to the dead. A few weeks after the above incident took place, two Jews came to our house and begged us to aid them in hiring some mules to take them to Safed, which had recently arrived from Beyroot, and whose muleteers had taken up their abode in our garden. They wanted three mules, and the roads being at that time bad, the muleteers demanded a high price, at least what would be equal to four or five pounds. They did not regard the exorbitant price, but urged the muleteers to set out immediately, which they refused to do. When Mr. N. and myself observed their impatience, we inquired of them the reason of it. One of them replied in a pathetic and enthusiastic manner, "We ought to be at a certain grave in Safed after three days." As I began to remonstrate with him upon the unlawfulness of the practice, he rose up instantly and said, "Good-by, I shall get other mules;" and away they went. This last summer I became acquainted with a Jew who came all the way down from the Crimea to the Holy Land, on purpose to pray to the deceased saints there. He called

it קברי אבות, which means visiting the graves of their forefathers. After satisfying his superstitious notions, he returned home to his wife and children.

The practice of praying for the souls in purgatory, exists universally among the Jews, and is, of course, one of the corruptions of the Talmud. To accomplish this, they have recourse to three expedients. The first is, to have a son pray publicly in the Synagogue for the souls of his parents; the second is, to have sufficient means to hire a train of readers of the Talmud, whose intercessions are supposed to possess a twofold efficacy; by them the souls of their employers are rescued from purgatory, and then benefited by their merit; the third is, to pay an annual sum to the chanters, that *they* may offer prayers for their contributors, which they do four times a week, twice on Saturday and once on Monday and Thursday. For those who pay best the prayers are chanted, but for the others only mumbled over in a monotonous tone, and that but once a week. These prayers are continued for eleven months from the day of a person's decease. The prayer is called אלמלא רחמים El Mollay Rakhmim, or מזכיר נשמות, The remembering of the (departed) souls. The fee is collected by those who are employed to pray, three times a year, viz., on the day preceding the feast of unleavened bread, on the pentecost, and on the feast of the new year. Those who cannot possibly employ the above expedients, die in despair, and the surviving relations give themselves up also to despairing lamentations. To such, death is indeed *the king of terrors*, but it is no less so, to every Jew, without exception, however able he may be to resort to the above expedients. Surely had the gospel no other recommendation than that of changing this king of terrors into a messenger of peace, it would be sufficient to make it the object of our warmest affection and choice.

Oppression, also, may be regarded as belonging to their religious rather than to their moral state. It is one of the מצוות commands or obligations imposed by the Talmud, and is therefore now practised everywhere by the Rabbinical Jews, but only by one class, viz., תלמידי חכמים *the wise men of the Talmud*, that is, the Rabbies who know how to explain the Talmud, over those who do not know, called עם הארצים Peasantry. The name is very much detested among them, although this class may read the Bible, and live an

innocent and pious life. The Talmud compares them to beasts of burden, and their lawful oppressors are authorized to do them any injury with impunity, while they can obtain no share in the happiness of the future world, except by laboring, trading for and supporting their oppressors. These arbitrary injunctions, and many more much worse, may be found in פסחים the Gammarah Psohhim, page 49.

Before I begin to translate the abominations which I have alluded to, I will state what my own opinion was respecting them before I was enlightened by gospel truth. I never dreamed that such atrocious acts could be put into execution. The same holds good respecting my poor brethren according to the flesh; and I may venture to say that the Jews, for many centuries, could not swallow such strong poison. For it is evident that the Jewish commentators upon the Talmud, as far back as the 12th century, and more especially the commentary of רשי whom the Jews regard as inspired, and whom they follow in every respect, have tried to alleviate the guilt of such assertions by explaining them away, as I shall show hereafter. And although they have accomplished something in this respect, yet the Talmud remains sufficiently corrupt to make it and its writers objects of abhorrence to the highest degree. The commentator, however, in seeking to remove the apparent danger, has succeeded so far as to make these corruptions more palatable, though their pernicious influence upon the soul remains untouched, or rather made worse. For every Jew drinks in his iniquitous commentary with great avidity, and without the least remorse, which they would not have done if the text had remained to speak for itself. Oh how blind was I to take them all to be the inspired word of God, or the spirit of the law and the prophets, as the Talmudists assert that they are. At the same time how gracious was the Lord to me in not allowing me to perpetrate that which the corrupt Talmud taught, and the more so that he at last snatched me as a brand from the burning, and thus made me an heir of righteousness through the lively and lovely way which the blessed gospel furnishes. I cannot therefore but feel deeply for my poor, poor brethren, who are yet left thus to grope in darkness, to be led by the blind, and to fall, broken, snared and taken by the subtle Talmud. The Lord has truly done a marvellous work, and a wonder among this very people.

The wisdom of their wise men is perished, and the understanding of their prudent men is hid. Oh Lord, hasten the time when the eyes of this blind people shall be opened, and their deaf ears unstopped, that they may listen to that blessed voice which once spake to this people in the following words. "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings to the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, and to proclaim liberty to the captives, and opening of the prison to them that are bound, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." Amen.

אמר רבי אליעזר עם הארץ מותר לנוחרו ביום הכפורים שחל להיות בשבת אמרו לו תלמידיו רבי אמור לשוחטו אמר להם זה טעון ברכה וזה אינו טעון ברכה ואמר רבי אליעזר עם הארץ אסור להתלוות עימו בדרך שנאמר כי הוא חייך ואורך ימיך הוא על חייו לא חס על חיי חבירו לא כל שכן אמר רבי שמואל בר נחמני אמר רבי יוחנן עם הארץ מותר לקורעו כדג ומגבו תניא אמר רבי עקיבה כשחירתי עם הארץ אמרתי מי יתן לי תלמוד חכם ואנשכנו כחמור אמרו לו תלמידיו אמור ככלב אמר להם זה נושך ושובר את העצם וזה נושך ואינו שובר את העצם תניא רבי אליעזר בן יעקוב אומר אלמלא צריכים אנו להן למשא ולמתן היו הורגין אותנו וכ וגדולה השנאה ששונאין עם הארץ את תלמידי חכמים יותר משנאה ששונאין אומות העולם את ישראל ונשותיהן יותר מהם תנו רבנן ששה דברים נאמרו בעם הארץ אין מוסרין לו עדות ואין מקבלין עדות ממנו ואין מגלין לו סוד ואין ממנין אותו אפיט רפוס היתומים ואין ממנין אותו אפיטרפוס על קופה של צדקה ואין מתלוין עימו בדרך וי"א אף אין מכריזין על אבדתו ותנא קמא זמנין דנפיק ברא מעליא מיניה ואכיל ליה ומקיים ביה מה שנאמר רבין רשע וצדיק ולבש

"Rabbi Eliezer saith, It is lawful to thrust through a עם הארץ even on the day of atonement which happens to be kept on the Sabbath. Then his disciples said to him, 'Rabbi, why dost thou not say to kill him?' (i. e. with a knife, as the Jews butcher animals.) Then he said to them, 'Because the former mode of killing requires no blessing, and the latter requires a blessing.' (The Jews before they kill any animal pronounce a blessing.) 'Rabbi Eliezer continued, It is unlawful to travel in company with a עם הארץ, for it is written in Deut., For he is thy life, and the length of thy days, and he (i. e. the עם הארץ) does not pity his own life, (i. e. his spiritual life,) how much less would he pity that of his fellow? Rabbi Samuel, the son of Natchmainy, said, in the name of Rabbi Yankhanin, it is lawful to tear asunder a עם הארץ like a fish, beginning from his back. Rabbi Akiba, (to whom I alluded

before, who is buried at Tiberias, and all the Jews pray at his grave,) said, when I was a עם הארץ myself, I thought, if one would deliver (into my hands) a תלמוד חכם (a Talmudical wise man) I would have bitten him like as an ass does. His disciples said to him, why do you not say (you would have bitten him) as a dog? Then he said to them, because the former breaks along the bone when he is biting, but the latter (i. e. the dog,) does not so. Rabbi Eliezer, the son of Jacob, said, if the עם הארצים had no need of us to trade with them, they would kill us, (propriety requires me to omit one sentence,) and the עם הארץ hates the תלמודי חכמים the wise men of the Talmud, more than the nations of the world (i. e. the Gentiles) do, and their wives yet more than they. (These latter clauses are ingeniously introduced by these great and cunning Rabbies to vindicate the malignancy of חכמים against the עם הארצים. The Rabbies have taught six things respecting him, (i. e. the עם הארץ) viz.

1st. He ought not to be chosen as a witness.

2d. His witness is not to be received.

3d. He is not to be intrusted with any secrets.

4th. He is not to be chosen as a guardian over orphans.

5th. He is not to be chosen as a guardian of public affairs.

6th. He is not to be joined with as a traveller.

And some say that if any thing of his has been found, the one who found it may keep it without making it first known. The former Rabbies disagree respecting the last, for he (i. e. the עם הארץ) may have a good son who would spend it for his own use, and thus the verse in Job will be fulfilled: He may prepare it, but the just shall put it on. Job 22: 12.

The commentary of רשי with respect to the first permission, that of thrusting through a עם הארץ on the day of atonement, renders the word לנוחרו, to thrust through, thus:

״ לנוחרו ״ ר״ל לבירשו ולישול דמו אפילו ביום הכפורים דאז יש לכל אדם שלום זה עם זה אפילו חכר מותר לבירש אותו ביום הכפורים וכן לקורעו כדג רמז דדמו מותר ליטול על ידי ביוש

i. e. to make a עם הארץ to blush even on the day of atonement, when all live in peace and harmony: and the reason why they called blushing לנוחרו, which means thrusting through, is, that when a man has blushed his blood disappears, and he becomes pale as if he had been killed, and we ought accordingly to understand the same of the next permission, to tear a עם הארץ asunder like a fish.

Such language as that of the abominable Talmud and its corrupt commentary, it need not be said, produces a vast evil, by infusing the most horrible doctrines into the minds of its votaries.

In the Gammarah Sabbath, page 63, the following injunction is to be found : אם תלמוד חכם נוקם ונוטר כנחש חגרהוא על מתניך אם עם הארץ הוא חסיד אל תדור בשכונתו If a wise man who knows the Talmud, (lit., a wise man in the Talmud,) retains anger and revenge like a serpent, put him on thy loins, i. e., associate with him ; but if עם הארץ a peasant, who does not know the Talmud, is pious, dwell not in his neighborhood, i. e., have nothing to do with him. In יומא Gammarah Yooma, page 76, and in נדרים Nedorim, page 32, it is asserted that תלמידי חכמים, i. e., those who are wise in the Talmudical learning, are free from every duty to the governments under which they sojourn, and of course the עם הצרצים peasants must pay for them. And, therefore, wherever the Talmudists have the power in their hands, which they generally have in all places, they actually press down the poor ignorant people, and grind their faces. In Poland and Russia, where the estimate of taxation is put into the hands of each respective community, and where the Jews have the same privilege, the עם הארצים ignorant people, are obliged to bear the whole burden ; especially if a levy of men is ordered, the only child of the עם הארץ is snatched away, and the many children of the תלמיד חכם remain untouched. Again, in the Holy Land, where one would suppose that oppression cannot exist, because all the Jews who go there from Poland and Russia are supported by their brethren in Europe, and each one has an equal share in the money which is sent for their support ; yet, as the Rabbies תלמידי חכמים have the whole management of their affairs, the עם הארצים ignorant people, that is, those who are ignorant of the cunning devices of the Talmud, groan under the sway of oppression. The portion of money due to them is withholden, or they get not the full amount, and thus are often reduced either to starvation, or to begging from the Spanish Jews. Many, in the bitterness of their feelings, have poured forth their hearts to me, and have asked my advice, how they should get the portion assigned to them, and how they should deliver themselves from the oppressions of the Rabbies. I was strongly tempted to go myself to the

latter, and remonstrate with them for their proceedings, but ill health disqualified me. The small room which I occupied at Jerusalem has many times been sprinkled with the tears of the oppressed, imploring me to take their part. Oppression is confined to the followers of the Talmud; among the German Jews, but more especially those of Prussia Proper, who are not deluded by the Talmud, no oppression exists, and this difference holds true everywhere. The evil influence which the Talmud exerts over the mind and heart, can only be known by those who have been under the tuition of its precepts, and have been rescued from its corruptions by the light and spirit of the gospel. Its degenerating iufluence is the sole cause of the degradation of my nation. It not only corrupts the heart, but it subverts the word of God, which would otherwise make them wise unto salvation. It is a poisonous plant, which destroys all who partake of it; so that I cannot but compare them to the valley of dry bones described by Ezekiel.

I shall mention one more point only, and then close my subject, though much remains to be told. I would briefly remark, that the Judaism of the present day is mostly the offspring of pure Talmudical abominations. That which is derived from the Bible, is either added to or diminished by the Talmud, which is directly at variance with the command in Deut. 4: 2, "Ye shall not add unto the word which I commanded you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it." I have alluded to the ordinance of circumcision: to this the Talmud by a direct injunction has added another called פריעה, which is the tearing of the fore-skin with the fore-fingers, which causes the most excruciating pain to infants sometimes for weeks and months, and many die in consequence of it. The Talmudists have the audacity to assert that circumcision without פריעה is useless. This assumption is found in the Gammarah Sabbath, section 13. In the following words רבי אליעזר אומר מל ולא פרע כאילו לא מל Rabbi Eliezer said, circumcision without the practice of פריעה is as if no circumcision took place. By taking this ceremony as a specimen of the perversions which accompany all the observances which are drawn from the Bible, we shall find, as I have before remarked, that these are blended with or absorbed by the Talmudical.

The more I become acquainted with the actual condition

of Judaism, the more I am convinced that much can be done among the Jews by missionary efforts, and particularly by those who are of their own nation; not only by preaching the gospel, but arguing against that which they call the religion of the Bible, and also by example.

The reason of my undertaking this representation of the actual state of Judaism, which has been a difficult task for me to persevere in, in my evidently declining state of health, is that my dear parents may know their condition, and that the pity which ought to be felt for them should go into more active operation, notwithstanding past discouragements.*

---

* On a review of this whole article, and a comparison of Mr. Calman's statements with those of Mr. Herschell, we apprehend it may leave upon the mind of the reader some wrong impressions as to the state of the Jewish religion in many of the countries where Jews reside. It is plain that the object of Mr. Calman is to show the defects and perversions of Judaism which prevail to a greater or less extent in most countries, for the purpose of exciting Christian sympathy in behalf of the deluded disciples of the Talmud, rather than to give a full account of the system. And many of the things here stated may be rationally accounted for, if considered in connection with their producing causes. They are the results of a blind and fanatical devotion to the senseless interpretations of the Talmud. The Jews who visit and reside in Palestine, are almost universally of this superstitious or fanatical class. Such, too, we are assured, is generally the character of the Jews of Poland and Hungary, at the present day, while the great majority of the Jews in Germany, Holland, France, England and America, pay less attention to the instructions of the Talmud, and conform, in their religious observances, to the teachings of the Old Testament Scriptures. These are characterized by few of the extravagances described by Mr. C.

It is worthy of remark, that, in the countries last named, the advances made among the Jews in the education of their Rabbies, and the instruction of their people in useful trades, since the commencement of the present century, have wrought a great improvement in the state of the Jews. In former times the Rabbies were educated only in the Talmud, and were almost universally unable to write or even to read in their mother tongue. This is still the case generally in Pal-

Let *those* be discouraged with the slow progress which the gospel has made among this people, who overlook the promise that "at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow." Let *them* tremble who go forth to fight the Lord's battles, and imagine that missionary labor may be unaccompanied by prayer and faith.

Spare not your prayers for the East, either for Jews or nominal Christians. The latter are in a most deplorable state, having lost the spirit of genuine Christianity, and substituted superstition in its place. The salt has lost its savor, and is good for nothing but to be trodden under foot, which is done by Jews and Mohammedans, who look with utter contempt upon the Christianity with which they are acquainted.

May the Lord soon break the chains of superstition and terror, and free their captives, that the Church may again triumph in her Redeemer.

---

estine, Poland, and Hungary, and will well account for the ignorance and fanaticism which prevail among the Jewish people in those countries. But in Germany, Holland, etc. the Rabbies are required by the government to be liberally educated, and in the most important places the services of the synagogue are frequently performed in the vernacular tongue. In Prague, Berlin, Hamburg, and Vienna, the synagogues are furnished with organs, and hymns are sung and sermons preached in the language of the country. The modern systems of popular education in Europe have also embraced the children of the Jews, and are accomplishing a great improvement in the intellectual state of that peculiar people.—EDITOR.

ARTICLE X.

A Brief Reply to the "Remarks" of Alexander Campbell in Defence of the Doctrines of "Campbellism:" Am. Bib. Repository for April, 1840, Vol. III. p. 469, seq.

By Rev. R. W. Landis.

To the Editor of the Am. Bib. Repository:

Rev. and Dear Sir:

There are a few things in the article of Mr. Campbell, recently published in the Repository, which seem to require a brief notice from me.

In your notes upon his "*Remarks*" you have said almost every thing that was necessary to be said. And I only regret that the exceedingly unfair dealing of Mr. C. has rendered it necessary to occupy so much space of your valuable Repository with a discussion like the present. But that great good has already resulted from this discussion, both in England and in our Western States, I am happy to learn; and this reflection may perhaps reconcile those of your readers, not immediately interested in its details, to its continuance through a few pages more.*

Since I have learned that Mr. C. charged me with misrepresentation, I have given my authorities a patient and careful examination; and am fully prepared to sustain every proposition asserted in my essay, in respect to the *distin-*

* In respect to the occasion of my furnishing the original Essay which was published in the Repository for January and April, 1839, you appear, yourself, to labor under a slight misapprehension. [See your letter to Mr. Campbell, Bib. Repos. April, 1840, p. 470.] My proposal to write for your work was as follows:—I named to you eight or nine different subjects, upon either of which I was willing to furnish an article. Campbellism was the subject selected by yourself, as the most interesting and important, and was accordingly made choice of by me. Hence I could not have had personal resentment to gratify, as Mr. C. has alleged.

guishing views of Mr. C. and his followers. The treatment which I have received from Mr. Campbell in his "Millennial Harbinger," where he has exhausted the vocabulary of coarse invective, was not unexpected by me, when I undertook the exposure of his system. *Pulchrum est accusari ab accusandis.* But with his epithets and personalities I have nothing to do. There are not a few instances in his "*Remarks*" (besides what you have in your notes pointed out) of a characteristic want of candor; especially those pertaining to the title-page and various editions of his New Testament. These, and whatever else may require to be noticed, shall be attended to in their order.

The first matter in his "*Remarks*" which demands attention, is on p. 476. Mr. C. speaking of my essay, says, "His chapters are four: 1st, On Faith; 2d, The Doctrines of Campbellism on Regeneration; 3d, Unitarianism of the Campbellites; 4th, The translation of the N. T. adopted by the Campbellites." Here we have, in a small matter, a proof of Mr. C.'s ability to evade a point. My essay is divided into four chapters, it is true. But he has divided the *first* into two; and dropped all mention of the second; that he need say nothing in answer to the important statements there made. See also p. 502. He has not in all his "*Remarks*" even referred to that chapter; though he professes to give "an accurate and true representation of his views" in *all* those points upon which he has been assailed, on the pages of the Repository. See p. 476.

Immediately after this (p. 476—480,) follow his *views of faith.* In respect to all the really important statements of my essay here quoted by Mr. C. on this point, he employs the following language. "We do indeed plead guilty of this charge. *It is a true bill.*" "Very good." "To this I fully subscribe; and the person that does not, has need to examine himself," etc. And he enters upon a long defence of his views as exhibited in my quotations. The reader will please to notice this. Is it not strange that Mr. C. should employ so many pages in justifying the views which I charged upon him, and then complain that he had not sufficient space to notice all my "slanders, misrepresentations," etc.?

On page 478, there is another exhibition of the arts of controversy. He says, "Mr. L. has imposed upon his readers by putting into my mouth words which I never uttered,

and which he can nowhere show in my writings." Now the words which he has charged *me* with putting in his mouth, and which he has copied, (pp. 477, 8,) are, as Mr. C. himself knew, a quotation from Dr. Jennings' account of the debate.* But *Mr. C. solemnly denies that he ever used such language as is attributed to him in this quotation.* Now let the reader, if he would learn the value of these disclaimers of Mr. C., just turn to the quotation itself, and compare it with the following passage from a work of Mr. C. written *after* all those from which I quoted in my essay. "*Faith never can be more than the receiving of testimony as true, or the belief of testimony; and if the testimony be written, it is called history*—though it is as much history when flowing from the tongue, as when flowing from the pen." *Christianity Restored*, p. 111. There is not only a real but a verbal resemblance between these quotations on the point referred to.

On p. 478, there is a similar manœuvre. On p. 100 of my essay, I made a quotation entirely and verbally accurate from Mr. C. He admits the quotation to be correct, and defends the doctrine it contains. And yet on the same page, and in reference to the same quotation, he says, "Mr. L. is too indiscriminating a reader of my works, *to be depended on in his quotations*, or comments." Are these the methods by which Mr. C. professes to be searching for truth?

In your note on p. 480, you have said every thing which was necessary to be said, in exposing Mr. C.'s evasions of

* In Mr. C.'s *Reply* in the *Harbinger*, (Oct. 1839, p. 486,) he makes some exceedingly coarse reflections upon me in respect to this matter. He calls it "an *unmanly*, *unchristian*," and "*most jesuitical attempt*," and repeats the epithets. But why should Mr. C. thus lose his temper, with what, by a little reflection, he must have seen was either a misprint, or at most a *lapsus calami*; for his own writings are notoriously full of wrong references? I regretted very much the mistake in the aforesaid reference, but not having an opportunity to read the proof, I could not correct it. Instead of reading thus, "Vide *Debate*, p. 32, 33, etc. ut supra," I intended it should appear as follows: "Vide *Jennings' Debate*, p. 32, 33, ut supra." And why should Mr. C. be thus angry merely at a wrong reference, while the quotation (as I show above) most accurately expresses a sentiment which he openly avows?

the point at issue. But in respect to the extracts which he makes from his writings on the following pages, I have only to request your readers to compare them with the extracts upon the same matters, contained in my essay, (pp. 101—108,) if they would see fairly exhibited a few of his palpable self-contradictions.

The following passages of his "*Remarks*" (pp. 484, 5,) I must present in full:

"I am no less travestied and caricatured," says he, "no less misrepresented on the subject of remission of sins as connected with baptism, than on the subject of baptism as connected with the whole process of regeneration. 'Mr. Campbell and his friends teach that immersion in water is *absolutely* essential to forgiveness of sins.' The most charitable construction I can put upon this, is that Mr. L. does not understand his own language, or select his terms with discrimination. *Absolutely essential* to forgiveness! This is equal to 'no baptism, no forgiveness,' in time or to eternity, for man, woman, or child. *I never formed, uttered, or wrote such an idea.* Have I not repeatedly said, that 'neither faith, repentance, nor baptism is *absolutely essential* to the future and eternal salvation,' for then infant salvation would be impossible?" And in his Harbinger, p. 492, speaking in relation to the same matter, he says, 'A more flagitious perversion I have never met with.'

Now if the reader would see the grounds upon which I based this imputation, let him read pp. 102, 105, 106, of my essay. Compare also the above disclaimer with the following declaration from his "*Christian Baptist*," Vol. VII. p. 163: "Under the former economy *blood was necessary to forgiveness;* and under the new economy *water is* NECESSARY." Or take the following from a late work of Mr. C. already referred to, "*Christianity Restored:*" "All these testimonies concur with each other in presenting the act of faith—CHRISTIAN IMMERSION, frequently called *conversion*—as that act, INSEPARABLY CONNECTED WITH THE REMISSION OF SINS; or that change of state, of which we have already spoken." "*The forgiveness of sins*, or a change of state, is NECESSARILY connected with that act of faith called 'Christian immersion.'" "No person is altogether discipled to Christ, UNTIL he is immersed." p. 202. And yet, in the face of Heaven, Mr. C. has solemnly affirmed that he "*never formed, uttered, or wrote such an idea,*" as that "immersion is *absolutely* essential to remission."

And as to the salvation of infants, pædobaptists, etc., (which is also referred to in the foregoing quotation,) the

reader may take the following from the same work, p. 240. "*Infants, idiots*, deaf and dumb persons, *innocent pagans*, wherever they can be found, *with all the pious pædobaptists*, we commend to the mercy of God."—"But one thing we do know, that none can *rationally*, and with *certainty, enjoy the peace of God, and the hope of heaven*, but they who intelligently, and in full faith, are born of water or immersed for the remission of their sins."

On the next page there is a repetition of the same thing. Mr. C. quotes from my essay the following sentence: "Mr. Campbell repeatedly ridicules the idea of the agency of the third person of the Trinity, either in the exercise of saving faith or in regeneration. p. 109." In reference to which, and passing over the proof which I had produced, he thus solemnly denies the truth of the representation: "Never, Mr. Landis--no, never!" See p. 485. Now in my essay, and in support of the statement I made, the following passage was produced from Mr. C.'s work: "It is one of the monstrous abortions of a *purblind theology*, for any human being to be wishing for *spiritual aid to be born again. Transfer such an idea to the first birth*, and to what an absurdity are we reduced!" Is not this ridiculing the idea? Take also the following from his "*Christian Baptist*," III. No. 9, wherein he says: "*If, by your own efforts*, you can believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, by your own efforts you can believe on him to the saving of the soul. THIS IS SAVING FAITH." When it is remembered that "*your own efforts*," in this passage is contradistinguished from all spiritual aid, what confidence can be placed in Mr. C.'s solemn disclaimers?

But in a late work of Mr. C.'s, already referred to, there is still a stronger instance. See his "*Christianity Restored*," pp. 279, 280, where, after affirming that, "when we speak in the exact style of the living oracles on this subject, *we must represent being born again, and regeneration, as relating to the act of immersion alone*."—He thus speaks of the idea that "the Holy Spirit is the sole agent in regeneration." "It is orthodox, spiritual, physical, mystical, and metaphysical regeneration."—"*The absurdity and licentiousness of such a view* of the great work of renovation, we had thought so glaring, that no editor in the west would have had boldness to have publishedi t." See also pp. 350, 351, and Mill. Har, VI. p. 75.

On the following three pages Mr. C. labors to show *in extenso* that I myself am a Campbellite.* He has labored this point very much in his *Harbinger* also. But neither he nor his friends appear to be much pleased with the accession to their communion. The assertion, however, that in my "*admissions*," as he calls them, there is contained every thing for which he himself has ever contended, must be viewed in connexion with the foregoing exposures.

On pp. 488—9, we have Mr. C.'s *creed.* It was a real

* In his reply to me in the Harbinger, (to which Mr. C. refers the readers of the Repository,) speaking on this point he makes still stronger declarations. That I might be spared the pain of making this exposure, I wrote to Mr. C., politely requesting him to correct the misstatement, but my letter remains still unacknowledged. In order to neutralize the force of my arguments against his system, Mr. C. says, "Mr. Landis is an immersed Presbyterian, and *therefore goes for immersion as baptism.*" "Then Campbellism is a terrible thing, when even its warmest foes *are constrained, even in the agony of their struggles, to* AFFIRM *all its most peculiar and offensive dogmata.*" pp. 507, 508. Now surely Mr. C .would not employ this language without having examined the subject. He would not affirm that I "go for immersion as baptism," and thus "*affirm* all the dogmas of Campbellism," without such examination; and all his followers therefore believe that he *has* examined the subject. And surely he cannot plead unintentional mistake, as he has even refused to acknowledge a respectful request to correct it. Now I *never* wrote a line advocating immersion as baptism; *and since I have been a pædobaptist have never advocated that mode of administering the ordinance.* The facts which Mr. C. has thus cruelly distorted are these: My parents were Baptists. I, when very young, united with the Baptist church, and was, of course, immersed. A few years after, and while yet under age, I became convinced that the views of my Baptist brethren respecting the subject and mode of baptism, were erroneous; whereupon I left them and united with the Presbyterian church; *and since that hour I have ever been a strenuous advocate of the views I then embraced.* Such are the facts upon which Mr. C. declares that I "go for immersion as baptism," and "affirm the dogmas" of his system. What would not a controvertist be guilty of, who can coolly and deliberately pervert facts in this manner?

pleasure for me to meet with it, for it evinces that he has abandoned many of the strange views formerly held by him. If Mr. C. will only fully return to the theory and practice of the religion of the New Testament, he will find those whom he now regards as his bitterest opponents, the first to give him a cordial welcome. But how will Mr. C. reconcile this his creed with his "*hostility to human creeds*," with the expression of which his article commences? See pp. 472—474. I should like to remark upon some things in his creed, but cannot now.

The next matter claiming attention is on p. 490, respecting the "*Unitarianism of the Campbellites.*" Mr. C. asks how I know that the majority of his sect are Unitarians? I reply that my essay, p. 305, seq. (to which I refer the reader,) answers the question in full, and that Mr. C. has not attempted a reply to the evidence there adduced. I trust that I shall ever be one of the last men living who would persist in fastening upon any sect an accusation, the truth of which they deny. But the question here is not what Mr. C. *now* believes, but what he and his sect have heretofore advocated. And that I do not stand alone in my estimate, of their *former* sentiments, at least, will fully appear from the following statements. One whose memory is dear to the church of God, and who will never be suspected of making unfounded assertions, the Rev. Dr. Jennings, of Nashville, Tenn., who gave Mr. C. such a signal overthrow in a debate to which Mr. C. had challenged him, says, "Among this latter class, (the Campbellites,) I asserted, (during the debate with Mr. C.) AND STILL DO ASSERT WITHOUT FEAR OF CONTRADICTION, are to be found, not only *avowed Arians*, but most of the infidels and semi-infidels in our country."—"Mr. C. did not, *because he could not, deny this fact without contradicting some of his own statements.*" *Debate*, pp. 81, 82. *Dr. Cleland*, also, to whose strong arm Mr. C. himself has learned to pay the respect of fear, and who is thoroughly acquainted with the system, after substantially declaring the same, thus remarks: "The family altar, the Sabbath day, the Sunday school, and the associations for benevolent and charitable objects, find little countenance;—yea, rather a most open, undisguised hostility to all these objects is manifested throughout the connexion, with very few exceptions. *The public voice will fully substantiate*

this." *Strictures*, p. 55. Other writers of considerable eminence have made similar statements.

But there is another species of evidence still stronger than this, *to wit:* Mr. C.'s distinct denial of Unitarianism, in his answer to my essay, has produced much dissatisfaction in the ranks of his followers. They are about establishing another paper, being extremely displeased with his denial of their tenets. His intimate friend and associate, who has long been a Campbellite, *Barton W. Stone*, well known as a most strenuous Unitarian, has taken measures to revive his own periodical, in which he formerly advocated Unitarianism. He is exceedingly out of humor at the declarations of Mr. C. respecting the Unitarianism of this sect. And yet Mr. C. would have us believe that he knows of "not a single Unitarian" in his ranks.

In Mr. C.'s reply to me, as published in his *Harbinger*, he has most unequivocally maintained the underived Godhead and supremacy of Jesus Christ. It affords me the sincerest pleasure to be able to make this declaration. But his *review* in the *Harbinger* appeared nearly six months before the one in the *Repository;* and the reader of them both will be struck with the fact that Mr. C. has in the latter omitted *all* those new and unequivocal expressions of his sentiments on this subject, and has substituted two or three ambiguous passages from his former writings, denouncing both Unitarianism and Trinitarianism. See *Repos.* pp. 492—496. On these pages the reader will see, that Mr. C. pronounces Jesus, "as to his celestial origin, *more than a creature;*" and this is all that he says in the Repository, in affirmation of his Deity. The only evidence, therefore, that Mr. C. here adduces from his writings to disprove his Unitarianism, merely proves that he denies the inequality of the Son to the Father; and the public will decide whether I was wrong in supposing such sentiments to be *Arian*, especially when their advocates were found denouncing all evangelical denominations, and at the same time fraternizing with Unitarians.

Let us now hear Mr. C. himself. Speaking, in his late work, (to which, by a singular coincidence, he has given the very name which the Socinian Servetus gave to his, three hundred years ago,) "*Christianity Restored*," pp. 124, 125, he attributes the leading doctrines in the evangelical system, to the "excogitations" of men. He says, "*Religious phi-*

losophers on the Bible have *excogitated the following* DOCTRINES and philosophical distinctions :—'The Holy Trinity,' 'three persons of *one substance, power and eternity ;*' 'common and special operations of the Holy Ghost,' etc. etc.—"Concerning *these and all such doctrines, and all the speculations and phraseology to which they have given rise, we have the privilege neither to affirm nor deny*—neither to believe nor to doubt—because *God has not proposed them to us in his word*, and there is no command to believe them." Are such sentiments any other than the distinguishing sentiments of avowed Unitarians? Does not the whole Christian world regard them as such? Mr. C. meets my arguments with the round declaration that he does not know of one Unitarian in his ranks ; and he repeats it, "*I again say, not one.*" p. 492. The reader, in order to perceive how much value to attach to this solemn affirmation, would, of course, wish to know what meaning Mr. C. attaches to the term Unitarian. In his recent work, above referred to, p. 122, he thus defines the term : "*What is a Unitarian?* One who *contends* that Jesus Christ *is not the Son of God.* Such a one has denied the faith, and therefore we reject him." Mr. C. knew, and every reader of my essay knew, that I employed the term in the sense in which it has ever been employed, to designate such as deny the doctrines of the Trinity, and the Godhead of Jesus and of the Spirit. But Mr. C., attaching an utterly unheard-of definition to the term, solemnly denies the charge, and accuses me of falsehood for making it.

But the absurdity of this definition of the term is manifest. For in this sense of it who are Unitarians except the Jews? The Polish Socinians were not. See *Fratres Poloniæ, passim. Socinus* himself paid divine worship to the Son. *Kinkade* (whose book I quoted at large in my essay) was not, though he denies the atonement, and maintains that we should not ask blessings in Christ's name. "*The American Association of Unitarians*" are not ; see their "*Tracts,*" especially the one written on *Mark* 13 : 32. Nor was *Thos. Belsham*, of London, for in his discourse on *John* 20 : 31, he says, "The title '*the Son of God*' is annexed to his character as Messiah." *Dr. Channing*, of Boston, is not a Unitarian, agreeably to this definition ; for on p. 11 of his Sermon on 1 *Thess.* 5 : 21, which called forth the "*Letters*

of Prof. Stuart," he thus speaks : " *The Son is Mediator*, and not the Father. The Father sends the Son, and is not himself sent ; *nor is he conscious, like the Son*, OF TAKING FLESH." Neither is Simon Clough, (who sustains the same relation to the sect of Chrystians, which Mr. C. does to that of the Campbellites,) for in his " *Discourses*," p. 15, he says, " Jesus Christ, by way of eminent distinction from all other beings, is emphatically styled in the original Greek, *ὁ υιος του Θεου, the Son of God.*" Now Mr. Clough is as strenuous a Unitarian as Dr. Channing himself.

But Mr. C. knows of no *avowed* Arians among his own sect, or that of the Chrystians. What is the ground upon which he makes this statement? Why simply this, *these sects do not recognise this appellation.* Mr. C. knows of multitudes in each sect who deny that the Son and Spirit are coequal and coeternal with the Father; and who ridicule the doctrine of the Trinity, and sustain the views of *Clough, Kinkade, B. W. Stone*, and other Unitarians; but because they choose to call themselves by the name " *Chrystian*," or " *Campbellite*," instead of "*Arian*," etc., Mr. C. tells the readers of the *Repository* that he does not know one " *avowed* Arian or Socinian" among his followers.

Does not Mr. C. know perfectly well, that though multitudes of Unitarians have united with his sect, *not one of them has abandoned his Unitarianism upon doing so?* The only change in their doctrinal sentiments has been in relation to baptism. That this statement may not appear to be too general, I will specify but an instance or two,—*Rev. J. Marsh* and *B. W. Stone*, were originally members of the *Chrystian* sect. The former was a zealous distributor of Mr. Kinkade's Unitarian work, and the latter a strenuous Unitarian editor. Both united with the sect of Campbellites without abandoning any portion of their doctrinal views : but (as Mr. C. knows) they retained and advocated all their Arian sentiments afterwards with the same freedom as they did before. And yet Mr. C. does not hesitate to come before the public with this solemn declaration, " I know *not one* avowed Arian or Socinian, teacher or layman, *in all our ranks.* I again say, *not one.*" See *Repository*, p. 492. We hasten to remark upon what Mr. C. has said respecting the " *Translation of the New Testament*," approved by the Campbellites.

When I said that Mr. C.'s translation was "adopted" by his sect, surely no one but himself understood me to mean that they had by a formal vote adopted it; but simply that *they used it in preference to any other.* Mr. C. himself is my authority for thus representing it. In his "*Addresses to the Brethren of the Reformation,*" for example, he constantly quotes from his own version. And I have always seen this version used by Campbellite preachers, when preaching from the New Testament. Was it too much, therefore, for me to conclude that the translation from which they quote, and from which they preach, was the one most approved by them? And yet Mr. C. ventures to say that his sect adopt no "translation on earth, unless it be that of King James." But if his sect do not adopt this version, what does Mr. C. mean when, speaking of *Messrs. T. Campbell and Emmons,* (the proof-readers of his Testament,) he says, (p. 75, edit. 4,) "Their classical and Biblical attainments *have been of much service to* US, and to THE PUBLIC, in the completion of this work?" What is the meaning of "*public*" here as distinguished from "*us?*" Let the reader ask himself whether Mr. C. here meant no more than that the translation was his own personal affair, with which his sect had little or no concern? Upwards of six years ago the *Rev. Dr. Brantley,* who is well acquainted with this sect, said, in the "*Religious Narrator,*" (of Jan. 3, 1834,) in some remarks upon it, "*They generally adopt a new version of the New Testament.*" Mr. C. copied his remarks into the *Harbinger,* Vol. V. No. 3, and commented freely upon them, without taking any notice of this remark; which was the most important thing (especially if untrue) that the Dr. advanced. And yet when I repeat the same remark, and upon the best of reasons, Mr. C. accuses me of falsehood!

Again, I said in my essay, that Mr. C. published *large* editions of his version, with the same title. Mr. C. admits that the first and second editions had the same title, but says that the assertion that they were "*large* editions," is "*utterly false* and unfounded." Now I have been accustomed to regard an edition of 2000 copies as a "*large* one," and therefore styled it such. I now proceed to *the number of editions and the title-page.* On these points Mr. C. charges me *with direct and wilful falsehood;* and in this instance makes a show of proving the truth of the assertion.

Now if the reader will be kind enough to turn back to pp. 497—499 of Mr. C's article, he will have before him the whole of what Mr. C. says on this point, and render it unnecessary for me to make a very long extract here. And let him then turn to pp. 312—314 of my former essay, and he will perceive every thing on which Mr. C. has based his sweeping accusation.

In my essay I make the following affirmations: 1. That Mr. C. published a translation of the New Testament with this title, "*The sacred writings of the apostles and evangelists of Jesus Christ, commonly called the New Testament; translated from the original Greek, by George Campbell, James McKnight and Philip Doddridge, Doctors of the Church of Scotland.*" In my essay, I quote, as it will be perceived, from the 2d and 4th editions of this book. p. 312.

2. I affirm also that Mr. C. published *several* editions of this work *with the same title.*

3. I affirmed also, as "*a sober fact,*" that Mr. C., even *after* he declares in the book itself that he had learned that Dr. Doddridge was not a Presbyterian, "issued the book with the same title." p. 313.

In respect to these facts, Mr. C. admits the correctness of the *first*, the *second* he denies point blank, and of the *third* he has changed the terms; and says I affirm that he "knowingly and designedly retained a falsehood on the title-page, for '*several large editions.*'" This language, the reader will perceive, is not mine. I said that Mr. C. *issued the book*, (not several editions, but the book,) with a title containing an untruth, as admitted by him in the *book itself.* But I am willing to give Mr. C. all the advantage of this distortion of my language. In my former essay I was unwilling to express myself respecting this transaction in as strong terms as the case really seemed to demand, but Mr. C. has himself done it for me.

It is upon Mr. C.'s denial of the 2d and 3d of the above specifications that he founds the strongest denunciations of myself that his article contains. But the reader will observe, that in his remarks he attaches a meaning to the phrase "*same title*" that is not attached to it in my essay. Mr. C. represents me as saying that *the whole title-page* of the third and subsequent editions was *precisely the same* as the first. No reader besides Mr. C. could possibly have

attached such a meaning to my language ; for the very idea of *different* editions must infer at least a change in the *date* of the title-pages. But, by referring to my essay, it will be seen that I say, that Mr. C. continues to publish his book with the title ascribing "*the translation*" to Drs. Macknight, Campbell, and Doddridge. Mr. C., *as my essay itself shows*, did change the title in other respects, but *he did not change the leading title*, which is the only one of which my essay speaks. In addition to this, and in connexion with it, I said that Mr. C. issued *several* editions with a title declaring Dr. Doddridge to be a Presbyterian. I ask, then,

1. Did Mr. C. publish *several* editions with a title declaring Dr. Doddridge to be a member of the Church of Scotland? Judge for yourself; here is the title of edit. 2d, so far as this point is concerned: "Translated by George Campbell, James Macknight, and Philip Doddridge, *Doctors of the Church of Scotland.*" No one will say that my use of the word *several*, as equivalent to *distinct* or *different*, is not strictly classical. Upon whom, therefore, ought Mr. C.'s accusation of falsehood to rest?*

2. The only other point in question is, did Mr. C. publish his book with this title when *he knew* that Dr. Doddridge *was not* a member of the church of Scotland? The reader will perceive that I have not, in my essay, charged Mr. C. with *knowing* this; but that I have merely stated a fact which he himself acknowledges the truth of, in his *Remarks.* See essay, p. 313. But as he charges me with saying this, I accept the charge,—and will now make the public acquainted with the facts in the case.

I will not enlarge upon the very singular circumstance that Mr. C. received his *collegiate* education for the ministry, in a Presbyterian university in Scotland, and yet did not know that Dr. D. was not a "doctor of the church of Scotland!"—Nor upon the fact, that with the highest pretensions

---

* Mr. C. often solemnly protests that he could have had no object in view in publishing his version, but to do good. I would advise the reader who may feel desirous to examine this subject, just to turn to the well known work of Dr. O. Jennings, and read his disclosures on this subject, pp. 123—142, and he will have fresh evidence of the value of Mr. C.'s most solemn professions.

to learning and general information, he had spent full twenty or thirty years in America, and did not know it!—Nor upon the still more astounding circumstance, that he had been the editor of Dr. Doddridge's translation, and of course had constantly consulted his notes and paraphrase, and yet did not know it!—These things would, we know, settle this point with most people; but we shall refer you to something still more conclusive.

The first *Preface* containing Mr. C.'s "Apology for a New Translation," is dated Jan. 29, 1826. The second edition appeared two or three years later.

Now immediately upon the appearance of the first edition, as Mr. C. well recollects, it was assailed from all quarters. And among many other things charged upon Mr. C. as proofs of his incompetency for the task he had assumed, *either on the score of dishonesty or ignorance*, was the fact that he knew not to what communion so well known an author as Doddridge belonged:—he knew not that Doddridge was not a Scotch Presbyterian, but a Congregationalist!

Mr. C. felt these remarks severely; and how does he proceed, when, a considerable time afterwards, he commences his *second edition?* Why, he publishes it, (as I have remarked, p. 313 of my essay,) *with the title-page still asserting this untruth;* while in the body of the work he apologizes for so doing. After referring to the fact that Dr. D.'s membership of the Scotch church had been denied, he adds (by way of justifying the continuance of his name upon the title) the following: "But as the Presbyterians and Congregationalists in this country do amalgamate to a certain extent, the differences are more nominal than real." Now what is the meaning of this apology? Is it not this: "Though there be an untruth upon the title-page of the first edition, I think it too unimportant to require correction?" And notwithstanding all this, Mr. C. avers that my assertion (as he calls it) that he "knowingly and designedly retained a falsehood upon the title-page," is "UTTERLY FALSE AND UNFOUNDED."

I have now noticed every important point which Mr. C. has attempted to stamp with an uncertain character in my delineation of his system. And after having, as you tell him, in your letter, "ample" time and opportunity to do justice to

the subject, the reader will perceive that he has not disproved a single statement, or overthrown a single position in my essay. More need not be said. Mr. C. knows, of course, what kind of appeals best accords with the taste of his followers; and is most approved by their judgment; and it would be presumptuous, I suppose, to assert, that in the present controversy he has not strictly acted in accordance with such knowledge. But be this as it may, I now resign both him and his proceedings to the judgment of an enlightened public.

ARTICLE XI.

Remarks on Cause and Effect in connection with Fatalism and Free Agency.

By Rev. Leonard Woods, D. D., Prof. of Theol. in Theol. Sem. Andover, Mass.

[*Continued from Vol.* III. *page* 193.]

The additional remarks which I shall make on the subject above mentioned, will be arranged under several distinct heads. And let me here repeat what I said before, that I shall refer to the essay of the anonymous writer, chiefly as an occasion of introducing several topics, which seem to require attention at the present day. It is not my object to fasten the charge of error upon any particular person. And if it shall, in any way, be made to appear, that the writer of the essay did not mean to advance and does not maintain the opinions which I call in question, it will be highly gratifying to me; but it will not materially affect my object. The question, whether he really holds the opinions which I controvert, I can cheerfully give up to be decided by himself. My object is, to examine certain subjects, which the reading of the essay has suggested to my mind, and to determine what is true and what is not true respecting them.

The first subject which I shall examine is,

THE POWER OF A CONTRARY CHOICE.

Many writers regard this as a matter of great importance; and some of them evidently suppose, that the power referred to is frequently denied. As there is really much indefiniteness and obscurity in the disputes which are carried on respecting this subject; we should do what we can to make it clear and definite. Let us then inquire what are the points in which all candid men are agreed; so that we may avoid needless controversy, and may, at last, fix upon the real question at issue.

First, then, all agree that we have *the power of choice.* Every man certainly knows that he has this power, because he often exercises it. While we live and act as rational beings, we are under the necessity of using this power, that is, of *taking by way of preference one or more things among several things offered.* In the common course of human affairs, different things are proposed to us. We compare them, and then determine or choose between them, so that we can no more doubt that we have *the power of choice*, than that we have the power to think or to walk, when we are actually thinking or walking.

Secondly. It must be evident to all, that *the way and the only way, in which our power of choice is acted out, is in the choices we really make.* We never exercise our power by choosing differently from what we do choose. This may be called a *truism.* But it is *true.* However great our power of choosing differently from what we do, we never, in any instance whatever, exercise it. This is clear.

Thirdly. All must agree, that *at the very time in which we make any particular choice, we have no power actually to make a contrary choice;* in other words, that we cannot at one and the same time make two choices, the one opposite to the other. However great our power of a contrary choice, we have no power to do this. If we should be in so singular a state of mind as to *wish* to do it, we could not. And when any one asserts, that we have the power of a contrary choice, he cannot really mean, that we can make the choice we do, and at the same time another choice opposite; for example, that we can choose to go north, and at the same time choose to go south. I think no one, who understands the import of words, can mean to assert such

an absurdity. And I must suppose it an inadvertency, that the anonymous writer uses language which seems to imply this, as he does, p. 407. Priestley says: "In any given state of mind, with respect both to *disposition* and *motive*, two different determinations are impossible." The anonymous writer rejects this; of course he holds, as we should suppose, that a man in the same state of mind with respect both to disposition and motive, may make two different and opposite determinations, and may do it *at the same time*. But I think he cannot really mean this, and if he does not, then what is the point of difference? For,

Fourthly. All agree that *we have power to make different and opposite choices at different times and in different circumstances.* Our choice at one time is in fact different from what it is at another time. How often is it the case, that we come to different and opposite determinations respecting the same subject? An unrenewed sinner chooses to disobey God and enjoy the pleasures of sin. The same person, when renewed by the divine Spirit, chooses to obey God and forsake the pleasures of sin. The power thus to vary our choices under the influence of different motives, objective or subjective, evidently belongs to all men, as we know from the fact that all exercise it.

Fifthly. It is a point in which all will agree, that, in any case, we might have made a different choice *instead* of the one we did make, *if we had been disposed to do it, or had found sufficient inducements.* A man who chooses the life of a *farmer*, might have chosen the life of a *mariner*, if he had been so inclined, or had found inducements sufficient to influence him to such a choice. This, I apprehend, is commonly the meaning of those who say, that we might have chosen, or had power to choose, differently from what we did;—not that we might at the same time have made another and opposite choice in *connection* with the one we made; but that we might have made another choice *instead* of it, *if we had been disposed to do it*, or *if our inducements had been sufficient.* These are the *necessary conditions* of choice; and without them *choice* cannot be. If a man should tell us that he put forth an act of mind which he called *choice*, without any inclination or inducements, we should say, he entirely mistakes the meaning of the word.

Sixthly. All agree that *we may hereafter make a choice*

contrary to what we now make. There may be such a change in our views, feelings, and circumstances, as will naturally lead to a change in our practical determination.

Seventhly. Whenever we make a wrong choice, all agree that we *ought* to have made a different choice, and that our not doing it was our own fault. There are in truth motives or inducements of such intrinsic value, that we ought to be influenced by them to a right choice; and if in any case we do not make such a choice, it is not because we are not *free* agents, but because we are *sinful* agents,—not because we are destitute of any of the faculties or endowments of moral, accountable beings, but because we are inclined to pervert those endowments; not because we have no power to choose, but because the power we have is under an evil bias.

Eighthly. I suppose there is a general agreement in this also, that *a man does himself determine the influence which external motives shall have upon him,* and that he determines this by the *dispositions and habits of his own mind,* or by *his own inward character.* A good man, by his pious dispositions, determines the influence which gospel truths shall have upon him. It is because he is a good man,—because he has what Christ calls "an honest and good heart," that the motives presented in the Scriptures excite his love, and lead him to obedience. Our Saviour asserts this connection between the state of the heart and the voluntary conduct, when he says: "A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth good things; and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart, bringeth forth evil things." Of this he gives a familiar illustration: "A good tree bringeth forth good fruit; and an evil tree bringeth forth evil fruit." This principle is constantly exercised in the affairs of life. By this principle we regulate our judgment as to what will be the feelings and conduct of men. We expect a man will have love, pity, generosity, or the opposite, excited by the objects placed before him, just according to his prevailing disposition or character. And if any one judges on any other principle, we say, he is ignorant of human nature.

If any one wishes to examine the fifth point above mentioned, and inquires whether we have not power to choose contrary to our inclinations and to the inducements presented before us; I reply, that we doubtless have power to

choose contrary to *some* of our inclinations, and some of the inducements placed before us. But have we power to choose and act contrary to *all* our inclinations, and to *all* the inducements placed before us? Did any man ever learn that he has such a power by acting it out? If not, how does he know that he possesses it? Can any man think such a power desirable? If he had it, would he ever exercise it? And of what value is a power which is never to be exercised? A power to choose according to our inclinations and desires, and under the influence of rational inducements, is a possession of great value. But a power to choose independently of all our inclinations and motives, and contrary to them, is a power to do an absurdity; and a power to do an absurdity is itself an absurdity.

But some appear to think that, in every case, choice and voluntary action might have been contrary to what it was, *supposing all the motives, external and internal, and all the circumstances of action, to have remained perfectly the same.* They think this is the main point, and that it is the very thing implied in the power of a contrary choice. In reference to this, I cannot do better than to quote the words of an author, who was no advocate for the scheme of moral or philosophical necessity, but who judged according to common sense and consciousness. The author referred to, (Dr. Whateley,) says: "If nothing more is meant," (that is, by the doctrine of necessity,) "than that every event depends on causes adequate to produce it,—that nothing is in itself *contingent, accidental, or uncertain,* but is called so only in reference to a person who does not know all the circumstances on which it depends; and *that it is absurd to say any thing could have happened otherwise than it did, supposing all the circumstances connected with it to remain the same;* then the doctrine is undeniably true, but perfectly harmless, not at all encroaching on free agency and responsibility, and amounting to little more than an expansion of the axiom, that it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be."

But if I have rightly understood the anonymous writer of the essay, he holds that this very principle, which Whateley says is undeniably true, and perfectly harmless, is the essence of fatalism. The doctrine which he represents as the opposite of free agency, and the great doctrine of fatalism, is, *that in the moral world, as well as the natural,*

the same consequences invariably result from the same antecedent circumstances. It is manifestly implied in what he and others advance on this subject, that they mean to speak of the antecedent circumstances as *the same in all respects.* All the dispositions, habits, and desires, every thing intellectual and moral, and every thing extraneous to the mind,—in a word, the mind itself, and every thing which can have an influence upon the mind, are to be regarded as perfectly the same. Now the position which I maintain, is, that when this is the case, the same consequences certainly and invariably follow. And I hold, with Whateley and others, that this is self-evident, and that to assert the contrary is absurd. If any man thinks that he has the power of a contrary choice, when all the antecedent circumstances are the same; I must request him to think again. And if he still insists upon it, that he possesses such a power, it is no more than reasonable to call upon him for proof. Let him give an instance, in which he has in some way exercised it, or if he never has done it, let him do it now, and thus end the controversy. But if, though a man really has this power, he never has exercised it and never will exercise it, then, after all, the existence of the power does not amount to much, and does not in the least interfere with the doctrine, that the same consequences do *in fact* result from the same antecedent circumstances. In this point of view, the question, whether a man *has* the power, is of no weight. For if he *has* it, but never uses it, the result will be the same as though he had it not. And so, according to the essay, the *existence* of the *power of the contrary*, being never exercised, would do nothing to shut out fatalism,—because, notwithstanding such a power, there may in fact be an invariable constancy and uniformity in the result of moral causes.

Here let me turn aside a few moments just to say, I hardly know how to account for it, that the author of the essay and some other writers should represent free agency *as consisting in the power of a contrary choice.* It must be obvious to all, that the power and the only power which we *really use*, is the power to choose and act as we do. To USE the power of doing differently from what we do, at the very time that we do any thing, is the same as to *do* differently from what we do at the very time that we do it;—which is a contradiction. We can indeed make a different

choice at *another time* and in *other circumstances.* But have we power to make a different choice at the very time that we make the choice we do? Let it be that we *have* such a power. I say that we cannot *use* it, except by choosing at the very time differently from what we do choose. But how can this be? At the very same time that we choose to speak the truth, how can we use the power of a contrary choice, and actually choose to speak falsehood? Now, how shall we account for it, that any one should represent free agency as consisting in a power, which, though it may exist, is never used, and the use of which would imply a contradiction? Does moral agency consist in the power to cause the same thing to be and not to be, or to cause a thing and its opposite to be at the same time?—a power to make a particular choice and a contrary choice at one and the same time? I certainly know that the choices I make and the actions I perform are the choices and acts of a free moral agent. And is not the power to choose and act *as I do*, all the power that is necessary to my moral agency? And how can the *power* of a contrary choice be essential to moral agency, unless it is essential to moral agency, that I should actually *make* the contrary choice? Who can reasonably wish for more power, than that which he exercises in all the variety of choices he makes, and in all the variety of his actions?

An obvious exemplification of the general principle which I would maintain, is found in the words of Christ: "If any man love me, he will keep my words." Obedience is the invariable consequence of love. And disobedience is the invariable consequence of the want of love. "He that loveth me not, keepeth not my words."—But has not a man who is now destitute of love, *power* to *obey?* Yes, on the proper condition. He cannot render a true obedience to Christ, *without love.* That any one should *choose* to obey, and should actually and sincerely obey, when he has no love, is contrary to the nature of obedience. He has then the power to obey, *conditionally*, and the conditions are such as arise from the nature of the mind, and the nature of voluntary action. These conditions are often expressed, and, when not expressed, are understood. And practical men understand them alike, and always act with reference to them. When they wish to induce a man to make a choice

different from what he has made, instead of appealing to the absolute power of the will, they labor at the well known conditions of the new choice. In this way, and in this way only, they hope to succeed. There are uniform laws in the moral world, as well as in the natural; and to attempt to accomplish any thing irrespectively of those laws, would be as unwise and fruitless in one case as in the other.

And now, as I have undertaken to remark on this particular subject, I am desirous of saying all that I have to say upon it, before passing to another. I shall therefore take the liberty to close my remarks by a few quotations from a late writer, whom no one can charge with the want of enlightened, patient, profound thought, or of a clear, discriminating judgment on metaphysical subjects.

"Those who plead for contingent self-determination, or adopt a theory which implies it," says President Day, "often claim to themselves the exclusive right to be considered the advocates of liberty. If this assumption be conceded to them, it ought to be distinctly understood, according to which of the numerous meanings of the term, liberty is peculiar to their system. Those who believe in the dependence of volitions upon motives as well as agents, are also decided advocates of liberty. But they do not engage to give their sanction to every strange or even absurd combination of ideas, to which any philosopher may think proper to annex the term, however contrary it may be to the signification of the word as sanctioned by common usage. It is agreed on all hands, that with respect to external actions, we are free, when we *do as we will;* when there is such an established connection between our volitions and our actions that the latter invariably follow from the other. When we will to walk, we walk, if we are free.—Now is internal liberty, or liberty of the will, the direct *opposite* of this? Does it imply that there is no dependence of our volitions on antecedent feelings; that they are as often contrary to our desires, as conformable to them; that however ardently a man may love God, this has no controlling influence over his purposes and executive acts?"

"According to the advocates of independent self-determination, liberty of the will implies a *freedom to either side.* This is otherwise expressed by saying, that whenever a man acts freely he has *power to the contrary.*"—Cousin says:

'An action performed with the consciousness of power not to do it, is what men have called a *free* action.'—'Liberty —belongs to acts which we perform, with the consciousness of doing them, and of *being able not to do them.*' In a certain sense this is undoubtedly true. In reference to *external conduct*, a man is free when he does as he wills. But does liberty imply, that when a man wills a certain act, it is no more likely to follow than the contrary act; that his limbs will as soon move against his will, as with it; in other words, that there is no established connection between what he does, and what he wills to do; that with the *same volitions*, his actions might be different?"

"But the advocates of a liberty to either side, would probably consider it as relating not so much to external conduct, as to acts of the will. Cousin says: 'Liberty exists in the pure power of willing, which is always accompanied by the consciousness of the power to will the *contrary* of what it wills.' But in what sense is it true," says President Day, "that man has the power to will the contrary of what he actually wills? He has such power, that with a *sufficient inducement*, he will make an opposite choice. But has he not power, you ask, to choose otherwise than he does, even though it be certain that he will never exercise that power unless there is some change in his feelings, or in the motives before him? A correct answer to this question must depend upon the extent of meaning here given to the word power. A man may have *some* power, and not have *all* power; that is, he may not have all that upon which the result depends. If the word power be used in its broadest sense, as including not only opportunity, knowledge, capacity, etc., but *motives of all kinds;* it is not true that a man has always equal power, that is, equal inducements, to opposite volitions. Has an honest man the same inducement to lie, which he has to speak the truth? When the saints in heaven bow in adoration before the throne of God and the Lamb, are they equally inclined to join apostate spirits in their rebellion? When Satan, as a roaring lion, goeth about seeking whom he may devour, is he equally inclined to promote the salvation of men?"

"But if the word power be here used according to its more common acceptation, so as *not* to include motives and the state of feeling, this is not inconsistent with such a

strength of inclination, as will certainly prevent any contrary volition. A man has as much power to speak the truth, *if he will*, as he has to utter falsehood. And he has as much power to *will* to speak the truth, *if his feelings are so inclined*, as he has to will to lie. But has he a power which will determine him to will one way, while his feelings are wholly inclined to will the contrary way? In many cases, there may be conflicting emotions in a man's mind, and therefore *some* power of motive in opposite directions. But when he comes to a decision, are the motives on the opposite sides always equal? Is it not the preponderance of one over the other which turns the scale? The man who wills in a particular way, under the influence of certain feelings, might undoubtedly will differently, *under a different influence.* But while the same mind continues in precisely the same state, in the same circumstances, and under the same influences of every kind, has it power to will in opposite directions; or if it has this power, will it ever use it?"

"If in asserting a power to contrary volitions, nothing more is intended, than that a *different influence* might occasion an opposite decision of the will, this is not inconsistent with the dependence of volition on the state of the heart, external motives, natural sensibilities, acquired propensities, etc. The younger Edwards, a strenuous advocate for the certain connection between volitions and their causes, admits that the power of acting implies, at the same time, a power of not acting. But he takes special care to guard his admission against the inference, that our volitions are independent of the influence of motives.——'Moral necessity,' Dr. Edwards says, 'is the certain or necessary connection between *moral causes and moral effects*;'——'and there is no moral necessity in the case, unless the connection be real and absolutely certain, so as to ensure the existence of the effects.' And his father says: 'Moral necessity may be as *absolute* as natural necessity; that is, the effect may be as perfectly connected with its moral cause, as a natural necessary effect is with its natural cause.'—'As it must be allowed that there may be such a thing as a *sure* and *perfect* connection between moral causes and their effects; so this only is what I call by the name of moral necessity.' According to these writers, then, a man may have a *natural* power to make a contrary choice, although, at the same time

he is *morally* unable to do it; that is, he is under the influence of such motives, as will infallibly prevent him from thus willing. It may be thought by some, that, by a *purpose* or *resolve*, we have power to give our volitions a contrary direction. But do we form purposes independently of all motives from without and from within? Will the same influence operating upon precisely the same state of mind, lead to opposite purposes and volitions?"

"If we pass from our purposes to our *affections* or *emotions*, shall we *here* find the liberty to either side? It is manifest that *different objects* may produce different feelings in the same mind; and the *same* objects will produce different feelings in different minds. But while the same objects are viewed in the same manner, by a mind continuing in precisely the same state of susceptibility, will the affections excited by these objects be so changed, as to become of an opposite character? Or does the state of the mind itself become contrary to what it was before, without any cause whatever?"——

"Will it be said, that our volitions are *partly* contingent, and *partly* dependent on something preceding; that there may be *some* influence from motives, and at the same time a power of acting in opposition to motives? To this it may be answered, that if the very nature of liberty of will implies freedom to either side, then so far as this is controlled, and our volitions are determined by the influence of motives, by the state of the affections, or by any thing else, liberty is impaired. The saint in heaven, who is under the influence of such motives as invariably excite in him holy volitions, has not the liberty of which we are now speaking!"

"Why have metaphysicians given to the terms liberty and power, when applied to the will, a meaning so different from that which they bear in customary use, and in reference to external conduct? In common language, a man enjoys liberty wen he does *as he wills;* that is, when there is a *fixed connection* between his acts and his volitions. Whatever interrupts this connection, impairs his freedom. But according to some philosophers, liberty of will requires that there should be *no* dependence of our *volitions* upon any thing preceding, for being as they are, rather than otherwise. External liberty consists in a man's acting uniformly, according to his *will*. Does internal liberty imply, that he

frequently wills in *opposition* to his *supreme affections?* When we say that a man has power to the contrary external action, we mean, that *if his will were different*, the action would be different. But some who speak of a power to contrary volitions, seem to mean, that under the *same* influence, and in the *same* state of mind, the volitions may be different. It is a power of contingence, a capacity of being subject to accident. Is not the term power, as it is frequently used, a mere '*metaphysical sound*,' which is to produce its effect, not by any distinct signification, in the connection in which it is introduced; but by association with feelings excited by the word, in cases of a very different nature?"

"Liberty is commonly considered a *privilege*. But what privilege is conferred by the liberty of contingence,—a freedom of our volitions from all influence of motives,—of argument, and persuasion, and affections? Suppose a man were to be endowed with a will which should put forth volitions wholly at random, without any regard to his feelings; that if these should urge him ever so strongly to go one way, his will would determine he should go in an opposite direction; that however much he might be pleased with obeying God, his volitions would lead him to disobey; would this be the perfection of liberty? Or suppose his volitions should spring up without any cause, or reason, or influence whatever, either from without or from within; would this be the most desirable condition of his being?" See Day on the Will, Sect. 4.

FREE MORAL AGENT.

A *moral* agent is one who performs actions which are of a *moral nature*, and are related to a *moral law*. But what is a *free* agent? The word free is relative. Taken in a good sense, it denotes the absence of something inconvenient or undesirable. A citizen of the United States is *free*. But from what is he free? He is not free from the authority of law, nor from the power of rulers. He is not free from restrictions as to the use of his property, or as to the business he shall pursue. In various instances his personal liberty is limited. Yet notwithstanding these various and sometimes unwelcome restraints, we say he is in a *free*

country, and is a *free man*. But from what is he free?—He is free from a despotic government. He is free from the power of a king or master, who rules, not according to just and equal laws, but according to his own absolute will. He is free from oppression, and from all unnecessary and unreasonable restraints. In the Scripture sense, a man is free, who is free from the dominion of sin and has the liberty of the sons of God.

But in the case now under consideration, freedom is spoken of as an attribute of an intelligent, accountable being. Here freedom is freedom from whatever would prevent voluntary, moral, accountable action. And in regard to this, we form our judgment, not by an abstract intellectual process of argument, but by *consciousness* and *common sense*. We *know* that we are moral, accountable agents. This is so evident and certain, that no proof is necessary. We *know* also that we are *free*, not indeed in all respects, but so far as freedom is necessary for those who are the proper subjects of law. We are free from compulsion or force. We *do* what we *choose*, and we *choose* as our *heart is inclined*. We are not free from moral law, or from obligation to serve God. And, to take another view, we are not, in our voluntary conduct, free from the influence of our inclinations and desires, nor from the influence of external objects. In our unrenewed state, we are not free from the control of a deceitful and wicked heart. If we are Christians, we are not free from the influence of pious affections. And whether we are Christians or not, we are not free from the established laws of the mind; and one of these laws we learn from experience to be, that the executive acts of the will, called volitions, follow our inclinations and desires. That we should have a choice or determination, not conformed to our inclinations and desires, is inconceivable. Such a thing never did exist, and never can. It is indeed true that our choice and our voluntary conduct often have an effect, direct or indirect, upon our subsequent affections and desires; and this discloses another important practical principle. But who does not know that the very choice or determination of mind, which thus influences subsequent affections and desires, does itself spring from affections and desires already existing? Nor is this any thing strange. In many cases we find that the same thing is the effect of a pre-existing

cause, and the cause of a subsequent effect; and that this last effect becomes the cause of another effect, and so on. No man can be a watchful observer of human affairs, without perceiving such a concatenation of causes and effects in the common course of divine Providence.

The doctrine that our volitions, or the determinations of our will proceed from our affections, is thought by some to be liable to objection with regard to the case of Adam. How, it is asked, could he be influenced in the act of his will to disobey, *by his affections*, or *the state of his heart*, when his affections were holy? I answer; while his affections all remained holy, he could not be influenced by them to disobey. But he was mutable, and the affections of his heart, which were once holy, became sinful. And it agrees with common experience, that sinful affections of heart should lead to voluntary transgression.—But *how* did his heart change from holiness to sin? I answer; he certainly did change, and the change must have begun somewhere. As I never experienced such a change myself, and as I am unable to look into Adam's mind and trace the process of thought and feeling which took place when he became a transgressor, I cannot tell *how* he changed from holiness to sin. This lies beyond my province. But as the inclinations, affections and desires of the heart are evidently the chief springs of voluntary action, it would seem very probable, that the change in Adam's character commenced in his heart, and that his sinful heart led to the act of disobedience. And it is certainly no more difficult to show *how* his affections became corrupt, and how these corrupt affections led to voluntary transgression, than it is to show how he could choose to transgress, while the affections and desires of his heart were all pure, and how this choice, proceeding from a sinless heart, could be sinful; or, in other words, to show how voluntary transgression could take place without any wrong feeling in the heart prompting to it. If, to escape this last difficulty, it should be said, that the first act of Adam's will to transgress, was an *ultimate fact*, and so not to be explained or accounted for, I could with equal propriety say, that the change of his heart from a pure to a corrupt state was an ultimate fact, admitting of no explanation.

If the case of the first transgression is treated *metaphysically*, there is no escape from difficulties. The common

theory is no more encumbered with them, than any other, and therefore the existence of insolvable difficulties cannot fairly be urged as a valid objection against it. It may be that the theory of divine truth in relation to this matter has mysteries not to be explained, and depths which no finite mind can fathom. This we know is the case with many portions of divine truth. But after all, it *may* be, that there is nothing in this subject, which necessarily occasions any special difficulty. The difficulties which generally perplex us, *may* be owing to something wrong in our habits of thinking, and particularly to our undertaking to judge of that which is wholly of a moral or spiritual nature, by our speculative faculties. It may be that the views which David had of his own misconduct, when he wrote the 51st Psalm, were not only just and true, but the only views which were fit and profitable for him. The same may be said of Peter, when he went out and wept bitterly. It may be, that he then entertained the right and proper views—the only right and proper views of his own offence. All the truth and all the philosophy, which justly belongs to any transgressor, may be contained in the humble, contrite confession ; *I have done wickedly ;—against thee, O God, have I sinned : I abhor myself. The Lord is righteous, and I am justly condemned.* We know that this is enough for the purposes of salvation, and it may be that, in regard to *all* important purposes, this is the end of the matter. As it is a concern of conscience and the heart, it may be, that any attempt to work out the problem in a speculative, philosophical manner, is not only needless, but hazardous ; and that he who never makes the attempt, and is content to treat the subject merely in a penitent, devout and practical manner, is in the surest way to understand the truth, and to keep his mind effectually closed against the encroachments of error. And the time may come, when the wise and good man, instead of coldly inquiring after the *philosophy of sin*, will be wholly occupied in confessing and forsaking it, in seeking forgiveness for it, and in watchfully guarding against it. And if we could have access to Adam, and could ask him to give us an exact and faithful account of his apostacy, it may be that, after all he has learnt in the world of spirits for five thousand years, the beginning, and middle, and termination of his story would be, that he was made in the image of God, and was under perfect obligations

to obey his commands, but that he yielded to temptation and became a sinner. And it may be, that he would wonder at *us, philosophizing sinners*, that we should have so much trouble of a speculative, metaphysical kind, respecting our depravity, and so little of a spiritual kind, arising from a sense of the moral evil that is in us, and of our ill desert as transgressors.

I do not mean to discard mental philosophy, as a science. It is certainly interesting, and conducive to the great end of our being, to turn our attention to the nature of the immortal mind, and to observe the established principles or laws which govern its operations. But mental philosophy, as a science, has its own province, and should never interfere with moral science. It must be founded wholly upon the facts of consciousness. It must take those facts *as they are;* just as the science of physics takes the facts in the natural world *as they are*, and builds upon them. Now our spiritual consciousness teaches us, that we are the proper subjects of moral law, and that we are accountable to God for our conduct, and are deserving of praise or blame according as we conform or not to the rule of right. This then is a *fact*, settled for ever, and not on any account to be called in question. Whatever we find the laws of mental action to be, this fact remains. It is a first principle. What then shall we think, if a man comes forward and says,—If the laws of the mind are so and so, we cannot be moral, accountable beings? We tell him, the proper inquiry is, whether such *are* the laws of the mind. If, on a careful examination, we find them to be so, this can never justify us in setting aside the great fact of our spiritual consciousness, *that we are moral, accountable beings.* We cannot infer from one well-known truth, that another well-known truth, is not a truth. Whatever we find to be metaphysically true as to the nature of the mind or the mode of its acting—whether the necessarian scheme, or the opposite, or some one still different, proves to be the right scheme—the important truth remains in full force, and will remain for ever, *that we are moral agents, justly accountable to God for our conduct, and are praiseworthy or blameworthy, according as we obey or disobey the moral law.* Let us then no longer create to ourselves difficulties and perplexities by attempting to carry the decisions of the speculative understanding into the province of conscience or moral sense. Let us judge by our speculative

faculty on speculative subjects, and by our moral faculty on moral subjects—never suffering one of these to interfere with the other. In this way, the decisions of each may become more clear and satisfactory, and the disputes which are carried on by speculative reason, respecting the affairs of conscience, may all come to an end. And as to the difficulties which have been accumulating of late in regard to moral agency,—it may be that they are chiefly factitious or imaginary ; and if so, the best mode of treating them is not to *encounter* them, but to *dismiss* them.

MORAL NECESSITY.

Why should there be any objection to this phrase, or to that which is intended by it? Writers explain moral necessity to be the certain connection between moral causes and their effects ; or, the invariable influence of moral causes. Moral causes are the inclinations, affections and desires of the heart, together with the objects to which they relate. The language is scientific, and has its use in philosophical treatises, though not exactly suited to popular discourse. And yet the sacred writers frequently use language which implies all that is meant by *necessity* in this case, and they sometimes use the very word, and in the sense which scientific writers affix to it ; as St. Paul says, a *necessity* is laid upon him to preach the gospel ; and Christ says, that there is a *necessity* that offences should come, and that his death is an event which *must* come to pass. Similar language is often used, in common discourse, in which it is always expected, that a meaning will be given to words correspondent with the nature of the subject. Now as scientific use, in this case, so well agrees with Scripture use, and with the prevailing use in common discourse, what valid objection can be made against it? If we interpret the language relative to this subject according to the acknowledged principles of interpretation, giving it a meaning corresponding with the nature and circumstances of the case, how easily should we rid ourselves of difficulty? And is it a mark of candor and enlargedness of mind, to indulge a prejudice against modes of speech which have long been in good use, or *to insist upon fixing a meaning upon them, foreign to the manifest design for which they are employed?*

THE GREAT MISTAKE.

President Edwards and others say, what evidently agrees with fact, that the connection between a moral action and its cause is *certain*, so as to ensure the existence of the action; and that "*moral necessity* may be as *absolute* as natural necessity; that is, an effect may be as perfectly connected with its moral cause, as a natural, necessary effect is, with its natural cause." The truth of this must be perfectly evident, if we look at particular instances of moral necessity. The moral perfections of God, his wisdom, righteousness and goodness, are moral causes. The effect certainly connected with them or resulting from them, is holy, righteous, and benevolent action. Such a being as God *cannot* do *wrong*. He *must* do *right*. It is absolutely certain that he will do right. To suppose that infinite, immutable righteousness and goodness will lead to any thing but *right* action, is palpably absurd. The sincere love of believers to Christ is a moral cause, and is invariably connected with obedience as its effect. "He that loveth me keepeth my words." The effect follows from the very nature of love. It cannot be otherwise. If we know that any one truly loves Christ, we know that he will obey Christ. And if any one does not obey, we know he does not love. The *carnal mind*, or *depraved heart*, is a moral cause, and is certainly connected with its effect, which is transgression of God's law. They in whom this cause exists, Paul says, "cannot be subject to the law," and "cannot please God." Disobedience *must* follow from the carnal, selfish heart, as certainly as any natural effect follows from a natural cause. The disposition of Satan is a moral cause; and the certain, invariable consequence is, and will be, *rebellion against God*. To suppose it will be otherwise would be obviously inconsistent. The things above mentioned are very plain. Who will say they are not? Now because *right* or *wrong* action is the *certain* result of moral causes, does it follow that the action is neither *right* nor *wrong?* Because moral causes produce their effect as certainly and invariably as physical causes, does it follow that the effect is a physical effect? Because there is as *real* an influence in the one case as in the other, does it follow that the influence is of the same nature? It does certainly result from the corrupt passions and desires of

man, that offences will take place. There is a *necessity* for this. So the original word *αναγκη* signifies. See Matt. 18: 7. But can we conclude that this necessity is of the same nature with *physical* necessity? Or can we conclude that the offences which flow from it are destitute of a moral nature, and deserve no blame, because this is the case with the effects of a *physical necessity?* Here is *the great mistake.* And if any one falls into this mistake, he will be likely to go wrong on the whole subject. *It certainly is a mistake.* It is not true, that if the influence of moral causes is as certain and invariable, as the influence of physical causes, the *effects* must be of the same nature with physical effects. It certainly is not true, that because the strong and unquenchable love of Paul's heart had as certain an influence to lead him to preach the gospel, as the power of steam has to propel an engine, therefore he was no more praiseworthy for preaching, than an engine is for moving. Because the infinite perfection of God does as certainly and invariably result in holy and benevolent action, as the power of gravitation produces its appropriate effect, and because it is as really impossible for God to lie, as it is for gravitation to produce an effect contrary to its nature,—it certainly does not follow from this, that holy action in God has no more excellence or praiseworthiness, than the effect of gravitation in material bodies. It is not the high degree or the constancy of the influence which a moral cause exerts, that gives character to its effects. Nor is it the high degree or the constancy of the influence of a physical cause, that gives character to *its* effects. Moral and physical causes are in their nature entirely different. The fact that they are all *causes*, does not make them the *same* causes, or *like* causes. If moral causes have an influence which is equally powerful with physical causes, and which equally prevents or takes away all resistance, this does not alter the nature of the causes, nor the nature of their influence, nor the nature of the effects produced. To suppose that it does is *the great mistake.* If any one makes this mistake, he may easily correct it, if he will lay aside the technical language which occasions the difficulty, and will speak of cases, where moral causes exist and operate, in plain, common language, and for practical purposes —if, instead of saying that God acts under the influence of *moral necessity*, he will say, his actions certainly and invariably flow from his infinite wisdom and goodness—if in-

stead of saying, that *Christians* are influenced by a moral necessity, he will say, their love and gratitude to Christ, and their benevolence to their fellow men, are motives which certainly influence them to pious and benevolent actions—and if, instead of saying, that *sinners* act as they do, from a moral necessity, he will say, they act from the selfishness, the pride, the covetousness and desperate wickedness of their hearts. By contemplating these common and well-known facts, as *expressed in common language*, it would seem that all unprejudiced men may become satisfied. And why should not *scientific* men be equally satisfied, when the same facts are expressed in scientific language? But if any of us have a dislike to the scientific language of Edwards and others on the present subject, let us take care that we do not impute to them a meaning which never entered their minds, and that we do not deny or overlook what is equally a matter of fact, whether it is expressed in common or in scientific language.

FATALISM.

So far as the present subject is concerned, the word *Fatalism*, which is often used in a very vague sense, is evidently intended to denote the opposite of the doctrine, *that we are free, moral, accountable beings—the proper subjects of law—under the government of a wise, righteous and benevolent God—and praiseworthy or blameworthy according to our conduct.* Fatalism then must imply, *that we are not free, moral, accountable beings; that we are not the proper subjects of law; that we are not under the government of a wise, righteous and benevolent God; and that we are neither praiseworthy nor blameworthy for our conduct.* Fatalism may be set forth in a variety of forms; but in all its forms, it must imply what is stated above. It may be proper and useful then, to consider it as including these several points, which are here expressed in language which is perfectly unambiguous and plain. Now in order to satisfy ourselves whether the doctrine of *moral necessity* involves or leads to Fatalism, we must have a clear conception of what moral necessity is. And it will be just and right to consider it to be what its most intelligent advocates represent it to be; that is, *the certain and invariable connection of moral causes and moral effects.* The doctrine implies that all the external voluntary actions of men, and all their inward affections, purposes, etc., result

from motives operating in or upon the mind. Now, does *moral necessity, thus explained, involve Fatalism, or lead to it?* or, in other and plainer words, *does it imply all or any of the particulars above mentioned, which go to make up Fatalism?* This is now the subject of inquiry.

Does then the doctrine of Edwards imply, that we are not *free* agents? I answer; according to that doctrine, we are not indeed free in *all* respects. We are not free from the influence of motives, whether taken objectively or subjectively. To be free from this influence, would be the same as to be free from the most essential condition of a rational being. Indeed, till better informed, I must hold that acting without motives is impossible. According to the doctrine of moral necessity, we are not free from the *established laws of the mind.* It would be easy to show that, if we were free from the operation of these laws, we should not know what to do, nor how to accomplish any desirable object, and should be totally unfit to be the subjects of a moral government. Again; we are not free from *the sovereign, controlling influence of the Creator and Governor of the world.* To be free from this influence, would be to be free from the condition of a created, dependent being;—which is surely a freedom that no good man can desire. But according to the doctrine of moral necessity, we are, in all our moral actions, free from every thing of the nature of *physical force* or *compulsion*, and from whatever would hinder us from being the fit subjects of divine law, and justly commendable or culpable for our conduct. Moral necessity, as above explained, leaves us in possession of all this freedom, and of all the freedom which would be desirable or useful to us. According to the doctrine of moral necessity, we have liberty to act according to our choice, and liberty to choose according to our predominant inclinations and desires, and as, in view of all the circumstances, we judge to be best. Who could ask for more freedom than this? Surely we could not wish for a freedom to act contrary to our choice, or to choose contrary to what is most agreeable to our inclinations and desires, and what, all things considered, we think to be best. Such freedom as this, possessed and exercised, would take away all order from our mental operations, and unhinge our rational existence.

I inquire next, whether moral necessity is inconsistent

with our being *moral* agents? That necessity which is *moral* is widely different from that which is *physical.* It plainly implies that those to whom it belongs are *moral agents.* It can belong to no other. So that *moral agency*, instead of being excluded by moral necessity, is directly implied in it. Those who are *not* moral agents can no more be the subjects of *moral necessity*, than they can be the subjects of *moral relations* and *moral affections.* Moral necessity is found only where moral causes operate, and moral actions are performed.—Take the case of St. Paul. Who ever acted more entirely under a moral necessity than he did in preaching the gospel? (See 1 Cor. 9: 16.) And yet, who ever exhibited a nature and performed actions more evidently *moral?* Take the case of those mentioned Matt. 18: 7. There was a *necessity* that offences should come; but those who committed them most certainly performed actions which were *morally wrong;* that is, they were sinful moral agents, and deserved the wo pronounced against them.

Again. Is moral necessity inconsistent with our being justly *accountable* for our conduct? Now, if, under the influence of a moral necessity, we possess all the freedom which can belong to intelligent beings, and put forth an agency which is altogether of a moral nature, then surely we must be *accountable* for our actions. The examples above mentioned, and others of the same kind, fully illustrate this. Were not those who were chargeable with the offences which Christ said *must come*, accountable to God for them? A necessity was laid upon Paul to preach the gospel. And was he not accountable to God for his preaching? According to the Scriptures, there was a necessity that Christ should be put to death. But were not those, who had an agency in that event, justly accountable to God?

Is moral necessity inconsistent with our being *the proper subjects of law?* The answer is much the same as before given. In my apprehension, no beings, except those who act under a *moral* necessity, in other words, those who are influenced by *moral* causes, can be proper subjects of law. All agents must act under the influence of *physical* causes, or *moral* causes. Now so far as any agents act under the influence of *physical* causes, they cannot be regarded as the subjects of a *moral law.* The two things are incompatible. But to act under the influence of *moral* causes, is the same

as to act *rationally* and *morally;* which is the only mode of acting, suited to those who are placed under a moral law.

And why should any think that moral necessity implies, *that we are not under the government of a wise, righteous* and *benevolent God, and are not worthy of praise or blame for our conduct?* which is another point of fatalism. May not such a being create moral agents;—agents who act under the influence of moral causes? We shall find that the very circumstance upon which conscience fixes, as that which renders us praiseworthy or blameworthy, is the circumstance, that we are influenced by moral causes or motives.

I acknowledge this to be one of the cases, in which direct, formal proof is difficult; not because the point to be proved is obscure or doubtful, but because there is nothing more evident. All that belongs to the doctrine of moral necessity, as stated by Edwards, appears to me to be a matter of *direct consciousness.* I am sure that I act in the manner described; and I am sure that I am a free, moral, accountable being, because I do act in this manner. I want no support for the doctrine, but my own consciousness. And whenever I have been embarrassed in my reflections respecting the doctrine of *moral necessity*, it has been the consequence of my mistaking the import of the terms by which the doctrine is expressed, or of my suffering speculative reasoning, not at all adapted to the subject, to interfere with the decision of consciousness. If we disregard the plain decision of consciousness, it is in vain that we seek for evidence from other sources.

I ask those for proof, who affirm, that the theory of moral necessity is *incompatible* with free, moral, accountable agency. Let them show in what respects it is incompatible. Let them bring forward some instance in which a free moral agent ever did deliberately act otherwise than according to that theory. They say indeed, that whenever they choose, they have the power of a contrary choice. But do they pretend that they ever, in any case, exercised that power? Do they pretend that they can exercise it?

As the charge of Fatalism has been so seriously urged against the doctrine of Edwards, I am desirous of making another free quotation from President Day's book on the Will. He cites the remark of Cousin, that "the theory of Locke concerning freedom tended to Fatalism;" and then

he says: "This calling in the aid of an odious appellation, is a very convenient and summary mode of confuting an opponent. It has a special advantage when the name which is substituted for argument, is so indefinite and mysterious, that the reader is in no danger of discovering its meaning. Fatalism is commonly understood to be something heathenish. But it has assumed such a diversity of forms, that it is sufficiently unintelligible to answer the purpose of an argument, which is most efficacious when least understood. It would be a more simple, if not a more satisfactory mode of reasoning, to offer direct proof of the reality of contingent self-determination.———Whatever was meant by the Fatalism of the ancients, it did not imply that all the changes in the world are under the guidance of *a Being of infinite wisdom and infinite goodness.*————It is urged that the Fatalists refer every change to a *cause.* So do believers in self-determination; not excepting even acts of the will.——— Is it Fatalism to believe, that he who formed the soul of man can so touch the springs of its action as to influence the will, without interfering with the freedom of its choice? Is a chain of causes, suspended from the throne of nonentity, to be likened to the purposes and agency of the omniscient Creator? Is it Fatalism to believe, that motives may have a real influence in determining volition, and that they may be presented by the providence of God; that the state of the heart has also some concern in giving direction to our acts of choice, and that this native or acquired state is not always the product of chance?——The object of our inquiry is to learn whether moral acts are determined by accident. If they are not, does it certainly follow that they must be subject to the Fates of the heathen? Is the authority over the heart so divided between fate and contingence, that what is not ascribed to one, must of necessity belong to the other? Is there no room left for any effectual influence from infinite wisdom and benevolence?"

"The suggestion that a denial of contingent self-determination leads to Pantheism, is as indefinite in its application, as the charge of Fatalism. The doctrine of Pantheism, as held by Spinoza and his followers, is that the universe is God.——What has this to do with the dependence of volition on the state of the heart, and the influence of motives? ——If in God we live and move and have our being, does

it follow that our life is his life, our motion his motion, our existence his existence? Is it Pantheism to believe that he worketh in us both to will and to do? Does such agency of his imply, that *he only* acts in the case? that there is neither willing nor acting on our part? that there is really but one agent in the universe? See Day on the Will, Sect. 9.

SELF-DENIAL.

This duty is sometimes thought to militate against the doctrine of Edwards, and to prove that our volitions do not always follow our strongest desires, or that we do not always choose according to our strongest motive, or according to what is the most agreeable. The anonymous writer of the essay says: "Do you not at times practise self-denial, and does this consist in choosing that which is at the time of choice the most agreeable?" Again he says: "The Bible never teaches that self-denial consists in choosing that which seems most agreeable." pp. 298, 299. Now, in my opinion, the duty of self-denial does plainly and strikingly *exemplify* the principle that we are governed by the strongest motive. When a Christian denies himself, he does indeed act against certain inclinations and desires, which operate as motives. Sometimes these are very strong. And how could they be overcome without something stronger? Why does the Christian deny these inferior desires and motives? He is influenced to do it by love to Christ, which is an affection of a higher and nobler kind than any which he denies. It is his supreme, his commanding motive. He is willing even to lose his life for Christ's sake. Luke 9:24. He hates his earthly relations in comparison with Christ, that is, he loves Christ above them, and under the influence of this motive, he forsakes them, when duty requires. So the apostles acted. Love to Christ constrained them. Under its influence they chose to deny themselves in regard to all their worldly inclinations. It was the most agreeable to them, as friends and followers of Christ, to do this. It was most gratifying to their supreme desire. Suppose any one should deny himself, without this higher affection, this superior motive, would it be *Christian* self-denial? The desires of the natural, unrenewed mind are very strong, and no one ever did or ever will deny and subdue them, unless he has a motive of superior strength. The strong man cannot be disarmed

and overcome, except by one that is "stronger than he." Luke 11:22.

PRACTICAL INFLUENCE.

If a man half believes the doctrine of Edwards; or if he believes it under a misapprehension of what it is; or if he believes it with a true apprehension of its nature, but gives it undue importance, compared with other portions of divine truth; or if he entertains the speculative belief in a heart destitute of holiness;—in either of these cases, the consequences of his belief will probably be pernicious. And it is the same with regard to all moral and religious truth. But let a man of clear understanding, and decided, ardent piety, like Edwards, Brainerd, Calvin, Hopkins, or Fuller, rightly apprehend and cordially believe this doctrine, and the consequences will be, in a high degree, salutary. The men who speak of the bad influence of believing Edwards' scheme, are those who do not believe it. But what intelligent, good man ever believed it, without experiencing happy effects from it? The great body of ministers in New England since the days of Edwards, have embraced his theory. They have all along heard it alleged by Arminians and other opposers of the theory, that it has a bad practical tendency. But they have never discovered such a tendency. It has been lodged in the minds of multitudes of the wisest and best men. But they have all found its influence to be directly favorable to morality and piety. While those who declaim against it, and say that the belief of it has a pernicious effect, are those who do not cordially believe it. I will only add, that my full conviction is, that the doctrine of Edwards, in all its essential parts, is the doctrine of the Bible, presented in a scientific form, and arrayed against hurtful errors; that it tends to honor God, to humble man, and to promote growth in grace, and that those who reject it and embrace any of the antagonist doctrines, will suffer loss.

There are many other important subjects suggested by the essay, on which I have so freely remarked. But I can proceed no farther.

The questions proposed in the last number of the Repository by "Inquirer," appear to me worthy of special consideration; and in compliance with the wishes of the Editor, I intend to make such a reply as I may find convenient, in a future number of the Repository.

ARTICLE XII.

Critical Notices.

1—*Psychology; or, A View of the Human Soul; including Anthropology: being the substance of a Course of Lectures, delivered to the Junior Class of Marshall College, Penn., by Frederick A. Rauch.* New-York: M. W. Dodd, 1840. pp. 388.

Dr. Rauch, who is already favorably known to our readers, is a native of Germany, where he received his education, under the best advantages. He is now at the head of Marshall College in Pennsylvania, an institution which, while it aims at the general promotion of literature in our country, has particular reference in its origin and design to the German population of that state, and embraces a theological department designed to train men for the ministry in the German Reformed Church. The work before us is the substance of a course of Lectures delivered to the undergraduates, and is designed as a text-book in that College.

A foreigner publishes a book in this country under some disadvantages, similar to those which an American experiences who publishes a book in France or Germany. There is the difficulty of acquiring an intimate acquaintance with the idiom of our language; the difficulty of becoming familiar with our habits and modes of thought; the difficulty of becoming so thoroughly conversant with the opinions that are prevalent in philosophy and religion, as not to arouse prejudice, or alarm the apprehensions of the community; and perhaps not the least obstacle in his way is the feeling, that, if a foreigner among us publishes a book, he writes for his own countrymen particularly who reside here, and not for the community at large. These difficulties are increased, if the author happen to be from Germany. The language is one of the most unmanageable of all the numerous tongues which the unhappy builders of Babel have spread over the earth; and nothing is more difficult than for a German to become perfectly familiar with the idiom of our language, and to think and write like an American. The prevalent opinions too in Germany are materially different from those which prevail in this country, on the great subjects of morals, philosophy, and religion; and

much as a foreigner may desire and design to conform to the usual sentiments in this land, and much as he may in heart accord with evangelical Christians here, still it is difficult to avoid phrases and modes of speech which will seem to savor of the neology of Germany, and which will excite alarm when the author little intended or expected it. There are not a few, moreover, in our land, who look with suspicion on every thing that comes from Germany, and who are ready to regard it as *prima facie* proof that an author is a skeptic, or a neologist, who happened to be born in the land even of Luther, and who publishes a book on any subject whatever. This number, we believe, is rapidly diminishing; and the time will come, we trust, in this land of freedom, when every book shall be judged by its own intrinsic worth, and not by the country from which the author happened to come, nor from the prejudiced opinion of any self-constituted tribunal.

We are happy to perceive that Dr. Rauch has succeeded in overcoming, to a remarkable degree, the difficulties above referred to. In general the style is simple, pure, and direct. In the main, too, he has mastered our modes of thinking, and has become well acquainted with the prevailing views of morals, philosophy and religion in our land.

If there are disadvantages, however, under which a German is placed, who publishes a book in our language and country, there are also great advantages which a ripe scholar from a German university has. The vast amount of learning in that language, and the rich collection of facts on all subjects that can claim the attention of the human mind, furnish peculiar facilities for enabling a native German to prepare a work that shall be useful; and we regard it as a very valuable accession, when those who come to dwell with us are disposed to employ the materials thus accumulated, with so much toil, to further the cause of education and piety.

The work before us relates to one of the most interesting subjects, to *man himself.* We would have preferred a somewhat different title to the work—a title that would better convey an idea of its nature and design, than the word *psychology* or *anthropology;* but the following partial summary of the contents will show that the *subjects* discussed are interesting to every man, and open a vast field of inquiry. Introduction. Chap. I. Difference between man and animal. Chap. II. Life. The principle of individual life, instinct, the ingenuity of animals, relation of instinct to man. Part I. Anthropology. Ch. I. The influence of nature upon man—of the sun, moon, earth, races, national differences, etc.;—sexual difference; temperaments—

sanguine, melancholic, choleric, phlegmatic; mental capacities, idiosyncracy, etc. Ch. II. The natural modifications of mind produced by age, waking, sleeping, dreaming, etc. Ch. III. The power of the mind over the body; its form, its health, its habits, its power of expressing emotions, etc. Part II. Psychology. Introduction. Self-consciousness. Section I. On reason, sensation, conception, pure thinking. Sect. II. On the will, the desires, inclinations, passions, social inclinations, etc. On the emotions, pleasure pain, hope, fear, melancholy, wrath, joy, RELIGION, etc. From this quite imperfect analysis, it will be seen that the work comprises the wide series of topics pertaining to MAN.

We by no means intend an extended review. Our object is simply to introduce this work to the favorable notice of the American public. It has, in general, the following characteristics: (1.) The subject itself is one on which every man should feel a deep interest. It pertains to himself. (2.) It abounds with *facts* of a very interesting character, designed to illustrate the various subjects referred to above. Much industry has been evinced in collecting and arranging those facts, and they give a value to the work which will not usually be found connected with works of this nature, and especially in our language. The collecting of these facts indicates an extensive range of reading and inquiry, and places the work almost wholly beyond the charge of being a work of mere speculation or theorizing. It contains in these facts the kind of information which the young need in forming an acquaintance with themselves, and in furnishing them with a knowledge of the wondrous human frame. (3.) The work is characterized by a sound discrimination on the various subjects of mental philosophy. It indicates that on these topics there has been much patient thinking, and much desire to tell exactly how a thing *is*. Emotions and feelings are separated and analyzed which are usually supposed to be blended together; and no student can peruse this work with attention who will not derive benefit from the aid which it furnishes in the power of analyzing mental operations, and in fixing attention on the workings of his own mind. (4.) Its general sentiments we regard as correct, and such as may be safely and profitably taught to the young men in our institutions.

While we would thus commend the work to the favorable notice of the public, we would at the same time suggest to the respected and learned author a few points on which a revision might be made with advantage. (1.) In a few instances there might be a more exact adoption of the English idiom.

A reperusal of the work would probably suggest the places where such changes could be made. (2.) In a few places the sense is to us obscure. To one trained in German literature, it may be clear, but we are not certain that we exactly get the idea of the author. There is to us an aspect of mysticism in a few places—a want of that direct, and clear, and straightforward expression of an idea, which in this country we expect. Our countrymen either *have* no time, or will *take* no time, to study out that which is not clear at once; and there is no law of literature better understood among us than that no author has a right to make us look twice to understand what he means. (3.) Some of the sentiments, though few in number, will not be found to be in accordance with those prevailing in this country, and, which is of more importance, with the truth. Of these, the most prominent is the view of the author on the *will*. We refer particularly to p. 143. If we understand his views on this page, they conflict essentially with proper notions of moral agency; and we would earnestly recommend to him a carefu' reconsideration of the views there presented and urged. "The human will," says he, "can be free only when it receives the divine will as its soul." We are not certain that we understand what this means. "As long, therefore, as a will is capable of choosing between the good and the evil, between heaven and hell, between the source of its life and that of its death, so long this will is not free." Now *we* should suppose that this was as good a definition of freedom as could well be given; and if the will in such a state is *not* free, we would ask, how is man responsible? Is "a planet that has no light in itself, but must receive it from the sun around which it revolves"—with which the author compares the will of man—is such a planet free? (4.) We would *especially* recommend to the author the revision and enlargement of the portion of the work on religion. We do not mean to imply that he holds any false and dangerous views on that subject; but we would be glad of a more full and distinct enunciation of the nature of the Christian religion, and of its relation and adaptedness to the human mind as it is. We would be glad to see such a statement of the work of the Redeemer, and of the special agency of the Holy Ghost on the human heart, as should make a young man acquainted with what Christianity is; and instead of the quotation from Plato at the close, we think the work would be greatly improved by a condensed view of the Scripture doctrine about man, and of Christianity as adapted to man though fallen; of Christianity as fitted to act on a fallen intellect and a perverted heart; as adapted to

restore man to more than the bliss of Eden; as infringing on no laws of mind in its holiest and highest operations; and as in accordance throughout with the 'anthropology' and the 'psychology' of man. Such a view would be eminently useful in our colleges and schools. Such a view we more need than any thing pertaining to education in its higher departments in this country. And such a view, we doubt not, Dr. Rauch has a heart as ready to furnish, as he has an intellect and a high order of mental acquirement that will qualify him for it.

2.—*An Historical Presentation of Augustinism and Pelagianism, from the Original Sources, by G. F. Wiggers, D. D., Professor of Theology in the University of Rostock, etc. Translated from the German, with Notes and Additions, by Rev. Ralph Emerson, Prof. of Eccl. Hist. in the Theol. Sem. Andover, Mass.* Andover and New-York: Gould, Newman & Saxton, 1840. pp. 383.

The expected publication of this volume was announced in the April No. of the Repository. It is now before us in the usual chaste and accurate style of typography and of general execution which characterizes the Andover press. As far as we are able to judge, the translator also has done his work with faithfulness and ability. This indeed was to be expected from so ripe a scholar as Professor Emerson; and whatever have been the difficulties of the task, he has certainly succeeded in presenting us with the original work of the German author in a chaste and perspicuous English style. The "Notes and Additions," also by the Translator, are such as could have been supplied only by one deeply and extensively learned in the history of religious opinions, in past ages, and at the same time awake to the existing state of controversies in respect to the points under consideration. They are generally brief, and, in most cases, such as seem necessary to explain the statements and correct the occasional errors of the author, and to supply some important omissions in his history. They add not a little to the value of the work, especially for American and English readers.

The questions involved in the controversy which is here associated with the names of Augustine and Pelagius, have been among the most important causes of differences and divisions in the Church in every age. The views which have been entertained on these questions have characterized the doctrines of theologians both before and since the Reforma-

tion. And at the present time these questions are assuming new degrees of interest and importance both in England and America. "Ancient Christianity," says our Translator, "for better or for worse, must soon become more perfectly known to the Protestant world. And good it is that it should be so, painful and surprising in themselves as may be some of the disclosures. Such advocates of patristic authority as have recently appeared in England, will spare no pains in accomplishing one part of this labor. Nor less prompt nor less able will be their antagonists, in performing the other part of the Herculean task, if we may judge from recent specimens of their zeal and power. Consequences of the most serious nature, in England as well as in this country, are now seen to be most intimately connected with the historical disclosures that shall be made." But the early history of the doctrines of Christianity cannot be regarded as second in importance to the history of rites, institutions and modes of church government. While, therefore, England is now awake to the latter branch of history, it is well that Germany is found assiduously laboring in the other. The work before us is one of the results of these labors. It is regarded by theologians in Germany, and by those who have examined it in this country, as affording the best means of settling the questions on which it treats, short of a laborious investigation of the original sources.

Such a work is worthy of more than a passing notice. It was our design, therefore, to say, here, only so much as might seem necessary to commend it to the attention of our readers. We hope to procure, from a hand more competent than our own, a review of this important publication in season for the October No. of the Repository. We accordingly abstain from any attempt at a critical analysis of the work at present, in the expectation of being able, hereafter, to do better justice to its merits and the important topics of which it treats.

3.—*Ancient Christianity, and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts. By Isaac Taylor, author of "Spiritual Despotism," etc.* Philadelphia: Herman Hooker, 1840. pp. 554.

The author of this volume is deservedly popular both in Great Britain and this country. We have learned to receive with interest whatever comes to us from the pen of Isaac Taylor. Though his style, like that of some other popular writers, whom we could name, is more wordy and expansive

than we might wish, yet his views are generally philosophical as well as evangelical. His positions are bold and uncompromising, and, in general, well sustained by appropriate argument, whether drawn from reason, history, or revelation. These qualities, together with his ample possession of the original sources of information on all the topics which are urged by the Oxford writers, in their "Tracts for the Times," fit him peculiarly for the task he has undertaken, in meeting the attractive and insinuating arguments of those learned divines, in favor of the revival of the forms and usages of "Ancient Christianity" in the Church of England.

Few, perhaps, of our readers are aware of the importance of the crisis to which the English church, and even the Episcopal church in our own country, have come. The general scheme of principles and sentiments that has been embodied in the Oxford Tracts is working a great revolution in those churches; and though, as our author remarks, it advances upon them "in noiseless slippers," it nevertheless proceeds with "a still depth, a latent power, a momentum and a consistency in its development, which are the very characteristics of those movements that are to go on, and are to bring with them great changes, whether for the better or the worse." The influences, therefore, to be met, by the masterly hand and the burnished weapons of our author, are not such as may be despised. Proceeding from the most venerable of the English Universities, and sustained, as they are, by the most learned of the British Reviews, they not only endanger the purity of the Episcopal church, but threaten to bring discredit upon the cause of Protestantism universally. A thorough discussion of these principles, therefore, and a manly resistance of their tendency to sanction some of the worst features of Popery, have become indispensable. Such a discussion has been well begun by Mr. Taylor.

An able writer in the present No. of the Repository, (page 165, seq.) has given us a brief synopsis of the principal points embraced in the Oxford Tracts, with some account of the authors by whom they have been advanced. The same writer, it is hoped, will exhibit more fully, in a future No., the progress of this controversy. On these accounts we omit any further statement here of the topics in question, and will close this notice by briefly presenting the main point of the argument, urged home upon the Oxford divines in the work before us.

Our author regards it as a singular oversight in the learned

authors of the Tracts, that, while, in tones of solemn remonstrance, they are "calling upon the church to retrace its heedless steps, and to realize, so far as possible, an imitation of the religious notions and practices of the second and third centuries, and while they would fain render the apostolic English church a very copy (its sufferings excepted) of the church as we find it under Dionysius and Cyprian, yet exclude from their copy the most characteristic and prominent feature of their venerable pattern." This feature, this "luminous point," in the teaching, and in the concomitant practice, of the ancient church, was the celestial or angelic excellence of virginity and celibacy. Our author, therefore, instead of carrying forward a multifarious inquiry concerning the numerous topics of early opinion and practice, seizes upon this one point, as having intimate alliances with the entire ecclesiastical and religious system of antiquity; and the very point and hinge of his argument is to prove that the corruption of the church, after the time of the Apostles, was not so gradual and progressive, from age to age, as has generally been supposed; but that there was in the church "a very early expansion of false and pernicious notions, in their mature proportions," and that they were even then attended with some of their worst fruits. Of these notions the most influential and controlling was the opinion universally entertained concerning the merits and the spiritual efficacy of celibacy, and especially of uncontaminated virginity; taken in connection with the practices thence immediately resulting, and the sanctioned institutions to which, in an early age, it gave rise. The reader, who has never investigated this field, will be astonished, as well as grieved, with the amount of evidence adduced that the notions above referred to were nearly or quite as flagrant in the second, as in the twelfth century; that even in the second century they were no novelties; that they early affected the universal church; that they were at once the causes and the effects of errors in theology, of perverted moral sentiments, of superstitious usages, and of hierarchical usurpations. Enough, at least, is proved on these subjects to afford us good reason for regarding with extreme caution any attempt to induce the modern church to imitate the ancient, at any time, after the Apostolic age. We have a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto we do well that we take heed. "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

4.—Harpers' Family Library, No. XCIX.—*The Sidereal Heavens, and other subjects connected with Astronomy, as illustrative of the Character of the Deity, and of an Infinity of Worlds. By Thomas Dick, L. L. D. Author of "Celestial Scenery," "The Christian Philosopher," etc. etc.* New-York, Harper & Brothers, 1840. pp. 432.

By the mass of readers whose education is confined to the English language, the word *Sidereal* is not as readily understood as the old Saxon *Starry*. The substitution of the latter word for the former, therefore, we think would have improved the title of this book, designed, as it is, less for classical than for popular use. The book, however, ought not to be undervalued on account of its name. It is a popular treatise on the starry heavens, and does honor to the series of the "Family Library," to which it is now added. It is not a labored scientific production, presenting the proofs in detail, of the numerous and grand results which it declares. The author designs to present the visible heavens as parts of the works of God. The most interesting astronomical facts are related and illustrated in such a manner as to be easily comprehended by those who have little knowledge of mathematical science. They are also to presented as to impress the reader with those religious considerations which are most naturally suggested to the devout mind by those great and marvellous works of Jehovah. We have here representations of the whole, and of detached portions of the firmament;—of the arrangement of the stars into constellations, with sketches of their mythological history;—the distances and magnitudes of the stars;—variable and double stars, and binary systems;—treble, quadruple and multiple stars;—the milky way;—groups and clusters of stars;—the different orders of the nebulæ;—the destination of the stars, or the designs they are intended to subserve in the system of the universe;—unknown celestial bodies, meteoric phenomena, etc. We have also arguments illustrative of the doctrine of a plurality of worlds, and of the physical and moral state of the beings that may inhabit other worlds, with a summary and comprehensive view of the universe; in all of which the author avails himself of the results of the most recent discoveries and the most accurate calculations in the science of astronomy; and presents them in a popular and attractive form.

This volume is adorned and illustrated with engravings to the number of more than eighty. It is a highly interesting and instructive work. We cordially welcome it to the family circles of our country.

5.—HARPERS' FAMILY LIBRARY, No. C.—*Outlines of Imperfect and Disordered Mental Action. By Thomas C. Upham, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in Bowdoin College.* New-York, Harper & Brothers, 1840. pp. 399.

We have rarely met with a more entertaining volume than the one here announced. Its plan and arrangement are truly philosophical; and the great variety and eccentricity of its illustrations are such, that they irresistibly allure the mind of the curious reader from chapter to chapter; and he feels himself enriched at every step, not only by the multifarious facts presented by the author, but by the numerous illustrations of the principles inculcated, which these facts are fitted to call forth from the storehouse of his own experience. Most persons, on reading this book, however much they may have prided themselves on their perfect sanity, will find, to their surprise, that they have often been the subjects of mental aberrations when they least suspected it, and that they have reason to be on their guard against those shades and degrees of insanity, which prevail unconsciously, to a greater or less extent, in the intercourse of a fallen world.

The plan of Professor Upham, in this volume, though a novel one in this country, is not entirely unsupported by authority. It was in part suggested by Pinel in France, some fifty years since, and recently more fully announced by a German writer, Professor Keinroth, who represents "the disorders of the mind" as "only limited in number and in kind by the diversities which exist in the mental faculties."

Our author adopts this general principle, and accordingly considers the philosophy of Insanity as parallel with that of Sanity. In preparing this treatise, therefore, he has pursued the same course and order of investigation which he would have pursued in preparing a treatise on the Philosophy of the Mind. He gives us, first, an outline of mental philosophy, and then proceeds to consider,

I. Disordered action of the external intellect,—sensation and perception, conception, spectral illusions or apparitions, disordered state of the power of abstraction, of attention, dreaming, and somnambulism.

II. Disordered action of the internal intellect,—suggestion, consciousness, relative suggestion or judgment, the principle of association, the memory, the reasoning power, the imagination, nature and causes of idiocy, derangement of the sensibilities, appetites, propensities, affections, moral sensibilities, etc.

III. Disordered action of the will,—imbecility of the will, and the will in connection with other powers of the mind.

Under these general heads are ranged a great variety of particulars, in philosophical order, and the principles stated are illustrated by numerous facts from medical works, the reports of prisons, asylums for the insane, etc. etc.

6.—*The Doctrine of the Will determined by an Appeal to Consciousness. By Henry P. Tappan.* New-York. Wiley and Putnam. 1840. pp. 327.

Most of our readers are aware that this volume is the second of a series of works contemplated in the plan of the author. The first of the series was "A Review of Edwards' 'Inquiry into the Freedom of the Will,'" which was published more than a year since, and was noticed at some length in the Repository for July, 1839. The subject of this whole discussion is not only fundamental in philosophy, and of surpassing interest in itself, but singularly wide and important in its relations to morals and theology. We rejoice to see it taken up in a manly, frank, and independent manner. This choice of epithets might seem to indicate some peculiar need of those qualities in such an investigation. So it does; and there is such need, especially when the discussion runs counter to the prevailing current of belief. It needs a disinterested love of truth, and undoubting faith in its prevalence, to venture forth upon this *Caspium Mare*, this Black Sea of philosophical speculation, never unvexed by storms, and always the dread of mariners.

Mr. Tappan has nothing about him of the partisan. "What I have written," he remarks in his preface, "I throw not out as a bait to logomachists, either in philosophy or theology: but I submit it to the cool, candid, and generous perusal of those who love truth, and who fear not to think." The spirit in which he has addressed himself to his task, and thus far prosecuted it, is eminently candid. Without pugnacity, or ostentation, (the appearance of which, at least, it was very difficult to avoid in approaching, with avowed opposition of sentiment, the examination of the system of Edwards on the Will,) he has quietly undertaken his Review, in the manner of one deeply impressed with the nobleness and certainty of the truth he espouses.

It may seem to savor of presumption, or at least of imprudence, in so young a man, to throw himself unattended into lists where many an older head, if not the wiser mind, would shun

the exposure, even if he possessed industry and inclination for the work. He is attacking a system that has ground our theological grist for many years: innumerable are the sacks of thought that have been bolted there; nor will we deny that the stuff which has come out has often puzzled the eater, and proved at once too hard and too fine for ruminating stomachs. Some have thought it needed the "triturating bran," we do not say of error, but of reality and of consciousness, to render it salutary, and to keep the mind from being made flatulent for want of practical truth. Our author may be esteemed an adventurer, with more of valor than discretion, thus to set out, in his very first essay, against EDWARDS ON THE WILL! Is he not a sort of Bedoween of the desert, running full tilt upon his Arab courser to overturn a pyramid? But pyramid or temple, we are willing the world should see whether it embalms a dead error or a living truth. We only say to those who stand astonished at Mr. Tappan's boldness, Gentlemen, read the books, and you will acknowledge that this writer has entered upon his inquiries with modesty and frankness, and also with a simplicity, and clearness in feeling, thought, and style, which are not always found in such discussions.

We must confine ourselves in this short notice to some little analysis of the work before us, the aim of the writer, and the degree and manner in which he has accomplished his object. This work is a Psychological essay, for which the Review of Edwards prepared the way. The plan of the whole undertaking embraces the following particulars: 1. A statement of Edwards' system. 2. The legitimate consequences of this system. 3. An examination of the arguments against a self-determining will. 4. The doctrine of the will determined by an appeal to consciousness. 5. This doctrine viewed in connexion with moral agency and responsibility. 6. This doctrine viewed in connexion with the truths and precepts of the Bible. The three first constitute Mr. Tappan's first volume; the fourth occupies the present work.

In the statement of Edwards' theory, the conclusiveness of the whole argument rests, of course, upon the truth of the exhibition; and, as to the deductions of our author from this theory, the question is not, how startling those consequences may be, but, are they true, are they legitimately drawn? If so, they are neither to be withheld nor softened.

The true difference between contingency and necessity is a point much labored by Mr. Tappan. He endeavors to show that the course of Edwards' reasoning rests upon the assumption of a wrong definition of contingency, as the synonyme

of chance. In reconciling contingency both with cause and certainty, and opposing it only to necessity; separating it from uncertainty and chance on the one side, and from absolute necessity on the other; Mr. Tappan maintains that the reasoning of Edwards, founded on the conception of a contingent will, as a will of chance and without causation, is legitimately set aside, and that the movements of a contingent cause may be foreknown in the Divine prescience, and yet not foreordained in the Divine decrees; i. e. they may be perfectly certain, and yet not necessitated.

Perhaps the most important part of our author's volumes is comprehended in his speculations on the subject of cause. Indeed, here is the jist of the whole argument, and the main point on which the reasoning of Edwards can be met. If you allow the correctness of his view of the nature of cause, his argument follows conclusively, but if you can show that that view is substantially false, his argument is as conclusively set aside. Mr. Tappan argues with all his force the point, that, in the very nature of cause, and as a necessary part of our conception of it, there is self-determination. He assigns the will as the *cause* of volition. The point of dispute, then, is simply whether the will is *necessarily* determined, not whether it is self-determined; for the very nature of cause is self-determination. Cause is ultimate, and if you make the will a cause, and yet deny its self-determination, you are driven to something else as the ground of self-determination, which itself must be a cause, and if so, then ultimate and self-determined; so that you must either deny causation in the will, or resort to the absurdity of an infinite series of grounds of determination, ever receding, but never terminating in cause.

He maintains, that, in the argument, that the will is always as is most agreeable, and that the sense of the most agreeable constitutes the cause of all volitions, disinterestedness ceases even to be a conception, and becomes only one form of self-indulgence; so does self-denial. The will becomes a passive *daguerreotype*, or a *camera obscura*, the colors of which change with the play of the sun upon it.

Our author represents Edwards as having mistaken the occasions of volition for its causes; a grand mistake, but one on which he has built his reasoning. Other philosophers, he says, have made the same mistake on other points; the occasions of the perception or consciousness of first principles or ideas, have been mistaken for the origin and source of those ideas, the conditions of our knowledges for the knowledges themselves.

Professor Tappan's style is clear and intelligible; which is a matter of the very first importance in discussions of this kind. His definition of consciousness, and his remarks on the perfection of consciousness as a form of intelligence, and on the true mode of interrogating consciousness, are highly important in entering on such a subject. The distinction of the emotions and passions from the will we think is as clearly made out as that of the reason and the will. His view of the mind as consisting of two elements of necessity, and one of freedom, with their distinctive, yet united action, is worthy of consideration. He maintains that necessity belongs only to the laws and rules of the reason and sensitivity, and that it does not belong to cause. All cause of volition is in the will, human and divine, and will is free. This constitution of mind, he thinks, accounts for all psychological phenomena. Our readers will have ready access to these volumes of Professor Tappan, and we need only add, that we think them worthy of a candid, thoughtful, and generous perusal. In his own view, "the question at issue is not a question between two schools of philosophy holding different theories of the freedom of the will; it really lies between the advocates of human freedom, and the advocates of an absolute and universal necessity." Let it be examined with freedom and candor, and we have no fears as to the result.

7.—*The Life and Opinions of the Rev. Wm. Milne, D. D., Missionary to China, illustrated by biographical annals of Asiatic Missions, from Primitive to Protestant Times, intended as a guide to missionary spirit. By Robert Philip, Author of the Life and Times of Bunyan and Whitefield; the Experimental Guide, etc.* Philadelphia: Herman Hooker, 1840. pp. 435. Also, New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1840. pp. 320.

In his preface the author says, "this book presents, in the character of Dr. and Mrs. Milne, a model which may be held up to any young man or woman, who is contemplating the missionary work. It exhibits an imitable example, as well as one worthy of imitation. The churches also will do well to study the influences which formed the character of these distinguished missionaries." In these sentiments we fully concur. We have risen from the perusal of this volume, with increasing love for the cause to which this excellent man devoted his life. Indeed, it was the cause of missions which drew out his talents and his worth, and transformed the shepherd boy into the worthy associate of the learned and lamented Morrison.

It should be added, however, that the early training of Dr. Milne eminently fitted him for the missionary work. His piety seems to have taken its hue from the mild and beautiful scenery of his native hills. He there learned—in the true, spiritual meaning of the phrase—to look through nature, up to nature's God. He loved his humble, quiet, mode of life, because it brought him into daily and intimate communion with his Maker. It taught him that best of all lessons, that his home was where God was. Hence "the morning star has often found him—where the evening star has left him—upon his knees before God, utterly unconscious of the lapse of time:" and hence too, there could be nothing narrow or local in his plans; nothing low or compromising in his conceptions of duty. Anywhere and everywhere he must have exhibited the missionary spirit.

The biographer has performed his duty with his usual ability. The work is executed much in the manner of his life of Bunyan. His style is always lively, and sometimes playful. He writes with a profound respect for his early friend, and with ardent love for the missionary cause.

We cannot suppress the wish, however, that the author had given us more of Dr. Milne's religious history. He says indeed, with some truth, that "journalizing in biography, is at a discount now." But we think "it possible to impoverish biography, as well as to overload it. The closet of any thoughtful and devotional man—especially in a land of strangers—is worth seeing." The journalizing of Brainerd and Martyn have done the church more service, than half the books which have since issued from the press.

The "Annals of Asiatic Missions" are evidently the result of extensive research. The chapter on the opium crisis discloses the fact, that "Dr. Milne was the first *writer* who denounced the opium trade, as the curse of China, and the disgrace of the East India Company." Though dead, we trust his voice will continue to be heard till this odious traffic shall be finally abandoned.

8.—*Narrative of a Tour through Armenia, Kurdistan, Persia, and Mesopotamia; with an Introduction, and Occasional Observations upon the Condition of Mohammedanism and Christianity in those Countries. By the Rev. Henry Southgate.* New-York: D. Appleton & Co., 1840. pp. 334, 356.

The author of these volumes performed his journey, as an exploring missionary of the American Episcopal Church.

The wisdom of their choice is manifest. Though exceedingly instructive as a traveller, he never loses sight of the great end of his mission. The principles which directed his movements, we give in his own language. "Whatever objects of interest fell in my way I allowed myself to see. This rule, from which I never deviated, proved, in the end, a source of no inconsiderable trial. Possessed from my earliest years with the most ardent love for travelling, and filled with an enthusiastic desire to visit the scenes which were the originals of the first pictures that my imagination formed, it was a sore temptation to find myself within a few days' journey of the once proud capital of the Persian Shahs—the city where Sadi and Hafiz lived, and Martyn labored,—while duty pointed in another direction. For the same reason, I did not visit the ruins of Babylon, though, at Bagdad, I was within a few hours' travel of them. And for the same reason, I denied myself the pleasure of going over Egypt and the Holy Land." From such a writer we expect the truth, and nothing but the truth. It was not his aim to invest his researches with the fascinations of adventure. We are perfectly satisfied, when we lay aside the book, that we have listened to an honest story.

But we have found the work replete with interest. The route which it spreads before us, is, much of it, new and unexplored. It takes us to the principal cities of Armenia, Kurdistan, Persia and Mesopotamia. There is enough of incident mingled with the narrative to make it attractive. There is hardship to excite our sympathy, and danger to arouse our fears. We close the book, truly grateful that the author has been spared to give us the fruit of his labor and his sufferings.

We rejoice to learn that two missions have already grown out of these researches; one at Constantinople, and another among the Jacobite Christians of Mesopotamia.

9.—*On the Relation between the Holy Scriptures and some parts of Geological Science. By John Pye Smith, D. D. F. G. S. Divinity Tutor in the Protestant Dissenting College at Homerton.* New-York. D. Appleton & Co. 1840. pp. 364.

The English edition of this truly valuable work was noticed in the Repository for January last, page 241. We need add nothing to the analysis then given of its contents, nor to our high commendation of its merits. It is a learned, manly and Christian defence of the ascertained facts of Geological science against the popular suspicion of their tendency to discredit

the truth and authority of Revelation. The principles of biblical interpretation, which it advances, are worthy of the most serious consideration, as contributing to place the student of nature and the sacred philologist upon common ground, as defenders of the one harmonious system of truth, revealed in the word and the works of God. The edition now before us is well executed, in an economical form, and we cannot doubt that it will be extensively read and studied.

10.—*Scotland and the Scotch: or the Western Circuit. By Catherine Sinclair, Author of "Modern Accomplishments," "Modern Society," "Hill and Valley" etc. etc.* New-York. D. Appleton & Co. 1840. pp. 288.

This little volume, dedicated to the "Highland Society" in London, is a series of letters to a female friend, and is designed to exhibit the characteristic and interesting features of the past and present times in Soctland. It is the narrative of a tour through the "Highland hills and glens," affording much of the general information, and local anecdote, which add so much attractiveness to the beautiful scenery which it describes. It is light reading, of course, which may be taken up and laid down at any place, without danger of losing the thread of the narrative, as there really is no *long* thread in the book. But the style is graceful and easy, and playful and entertaining, and the matter often instructive, and, what is better than all, its moral and religious tendency is unexceptionable.

11.—*Prize Essays on a Congress of Nations, for the Adjustment of International Disputes, and for the promotion of universal peace without resort to arms: together with a Sixth Essay, comprising the substance of the rejected Essays.* Boston: Published by Whipple & Damrell, for the American Peace Society. 1840. pp. 706.

A Congress of Nations has been a prominent object with the American Peace Society, ever since its organization. So long ago as 1828, a premium was offered for the best essay on this subject. In 1831 two gentlemen of New-York offered $500 for the best essay, and $100 for the second best, on the same subject. The committee of award, the Hon. Joseph Story, Wm. Wirt and John McLean were unable to agree in their decision. The premium was then raised to $1000, and the Hon. John Q. Adams, Chancellor Kent, and Thomas S.

Grimké became the committee of award, but with no better success.

In this state of things the American Peace Society authorized the publication of the volume before us. In respect to its typographical execution the work is uncommonly attractive—worthy indeed to be presented to "every crowned head in Europe, and to the Executive of every republic in America." The discussions themselves should receive the earnest attention of all in authority. Indeed, it seems to us, that men in the seats of power cannot avoid the conviction, while reading these pages, that they have a solemn duty to discharge to their constituents and the world. The present mode of adjusting national disputes clearly belongs to a barbarous age, and it should have passed away with the wager by battle and the trial by ordeal. It is the design of these essays to point out to the Christian and the philanthropist a more excellent way. It was hardly to be expected that they should give us an accurately detailed system. But the facts and principles which they furnish are exceedingly important. They have prepared the way for further inquiry and discussion, and we look forward with confidence to the dawn of a better day.

12.—*A Tribute to the Memory of Fitzhugh Smith, the son of Gerrit Smith. By the Author of "Thoughts on a New Order of Missionaries," etc.* New-York: Wiley and Putman. 1840. pp. 300.

The youthful and interesting subject, or rather occasion, of this memoir, died at Utica, in the State of New-York, July, 1836, at about the age of twelve years, in the exercise of a remarkably matured and intelligent faith in Christ. This tribute to his memory is not in the usual form of works produced by such occasions, a mere threading together of the incidents of the life and death of the deceased, but is constructed on a more philosophical plan, and with a higher aim. The starting-point of the author is his conviction that a nobler style of character than is usually seen, or is sought for in the training of youth, is demanded, and that the form of improvement required in the character of our youth, is especially in respect of its MANLINESS. This word then suggests the object and aim of the writer. It is to inculcate the importance and excellence of *manliness* of character. To this the narrative, the descriptive parts, and the reasoning of the book, all tend, and every thing is professedly excluded which might break in upon the unity of this design. We recommend the book as one of the most interesting and useful of its kind.

13.—*Domestic Education: by H. Humphrey, D. D., President of Amherst College.* Amherst: J. S. & C. Adams. 1840. pp. 239.

This little volume comes to us as an old friend in a new dress. It embodies the substance of a series of papers, which appeared in the New-York Observer, a few months ago, on Domestic Education. The venerable writer has yielded to a desire, repeatedly and urgently expressed, that he would give to his *thoughts* on this subject a more convenient and permanent form. He has revised the series and discussed several new and important topics. He has also inserted, by way of appendix, some twenty or thirty pages on Domestic Education from the London Christian Observer, which still farther increases the value of the book. In its present shape it may be entitled the Parent's Manual. It displays a thorough acquaintance with the wants and the perils of childhood and youth, and then, with singular felicity, points out the way to meet the former and repel the latter.

14.—*The Poet's Tribute. Poems of William B. Tappan.* Boston: D. S. King, and Crocker & Brewster. 1840. pp. 325.

This is indeed the *poet's* tribute. And, what is far better, it is the *Christian poet's* tribute. We are often pained at the shyness with which the sons of song approach the cross of Christ. Their notes are sweet and clear and full on every theme but this. The praises of a heathen god, or a modern hero, they can utter loud and long. But point them to Jesus of Nazareth—the scorned—the persecuted—the crucified one —and they are dumb.

Not so with Mr. Tappan. His inspiration is drawn from

> ——Siloa's brook that flow'd
> Fast by the oracle of God.

Most of his pieces are strictly sacred in their character: and we pity the heart which can dwell on some that we might mention, and not be made better.

The poem at the close of the volume, entitled "Missions," was pronounced before the Porter Rhetorical Society at Andover. We heard it then, and we have read it now, with great interest. There is genuine poetry in the production. Had we space, we could cite passages of a high order, both in respect to taste and genius.

15.—*Sermons on Different Subjects, delivered in England and America, by Rev. Edward Norris Kirk, A. M., late Pastor of the Fourth Presbyterian Church, Albany, N. Y. With an Introduction, by Samuel Hanson Cox, D. D.* New-York, 1840. pp. 316.

This volume is a collection and republication of eleven Sermons and four Addresses, which had before appeared in separate forms in England and this country. They are on the following important and practical topics:—Man's natural enmity to God,—Obligations of Young Men,—Jesus the Great Missionary,—The Gospel Ministry,—The Nature and Influence of Maternal Associations,—Sermon to Children,—Practical Love to Christ,—Temperance and Religion,—The traffic in Alcohol,—Valedictory Sermon,—Agreement with God, etc.

Though these discourses are by no means deficient in force and cogency of reasoning, there is yet less of systematic argumentation in them, than of warm-hearted and zealous appeal. The reader who has heard Mr. Kirk preach, will perceive that they are written in a style adapted to his rapid and fervid eloquence; and yet, to one unacquainted with the author, they would hardly suggest the idea of that eloquence. They will be read, therefore, with less interest, by strangers, than by those whose memory may enable them to supply, in their thoughts, the manner of the preacher. Yet they are good discourses, worthy of publication, as popular and faithful exhibitions of truth on the topics which they embrace, and as suited to impress the reader with a strong sense of religious obligation.

16.—*The Museum of Religious Knowledge: designed to illustrate Religious Truth. Edited by Marcus E. Cross.* Philadelphia: J. Whetham. New-York: Robert Carter, 1840. pp. 264.

This little volume, which is neatly executed by the publisher, is made up of short and stirring discussions of a variety of interesting topics. The authors from whose writings they are principally selected, are Hon. A. H. Everett, Rev. Drs. Spring, Hawes, Plumer, Smith, Babcock, and Mrs. H. B. Stowe; and the selections are worthy of the names with which they are accompanied. Several of the pieces are from the editor's own pen. These too, are written in a chaste and attractive style, and are suited to the place which they occupy in a volume designed to allure the minds of busy men and women to the consideration of moral and religious subjects.

17.—*Letters from the Old World. By a Lady of New-York. In Two Volumes.* New-York: Harper & Brothers, 1840. pp. 307, 337.

To the general reader, these Letters will be found second in interest to few of the numerous books of Travels in the "Old World," with which we are "being favored," in these days of increased and rapid intercommunication between the most widely separated countries. They are from the pen of Mrs. Haight, a lady of wealth and leisure, who has given us in these volumes the results of her observations in a tour, under the protection of her husband, and with the best advantages, through Egypt, Syria, Palestine, Asia-Minor, Turkey and Greece. It was not an idle curiosity which allured her away to those ancient lands. It was the longing of an enlightened and cultivated mind to become familiar with the scenes of the earliest times. Such a mind would be likely to find the principal pleasure of travelling abroad, in the instruction to be derived from the new and ever varying objects which present themselves in foreign lands. And we return our hearty thanks to Mrs. Haight that she has consented to share this pleasure with the public by committing these interesting volumes to the press. They are written in a lively, chaste and attractive style, and though they do not pretend to the precise accuracy of scientific observation, they may be relied on for a strict adherence to the truth. They are also characterized by more than an ordinary degree of good sense. The numerous topics and incidents which they exhibit are exceedingly miscellaneous, of course; yet associated, as they are, in locality and in history, with the oldest and grandest events of time, we read them with interest, as we love to be reminded of the line of our relationship, not only with the realms of classic antiquity, but also with

> ——————"the land
> Where the patriarchs rest,
> Where the bones of the prophets are laid."

18.—*The Scripture Doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, in their relation to God the Father. By Nathaniel S. Folsom.* Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1840. pp. 84.

19.—*A Letter to Ezra S. Gannett, of Boston, occasioned by his Tract on Atonement. By Nehemiah Adams, Pastor of Essex-street Church.* Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1840. pp. 64.

These two publications, if we mistake not, are worthy of some more extended remarks than we have room to make in

this notice. The Letter of Mr. Adams is written in the best style of controversy, and is especially valuable as containing a clear, satisfactory and popular defence of the Scripture doctrine of the Atonement, and at the same time exhibiting the fact, that this cardinal doctrine of Christianity is rejected, not only by Mr. Gannett, but by "the American Unitarian Association." Considered in connection, these publications will inculcate some important lessons, which we hope to present in a future No. of the Repository.

20.—President Beecher on Baptism.

On recurring to the article of President Beecher on Baptism, in the Repository for January and April last, our readers will notice that there is some incompleteness in the argument as indicated in the plan, and as also intimated on pp. 366, 368. This was perceived by ourselves on reading the MS., but owing to some delay in Mr. Beecher's correspondence, we had the best reason to suppose that we had received all that he intended to furnish on the subject. We accordingly inserted the part which appeared in the April No., as *concluding* his discussion. He since informs us that he was disappointed by this announcement, and that he fears the result *may* be a premature answer to an unfinished discussion.

We have therefore judged it proper, as a caveat against any such premature reply, from any quarter, and as due to Pres. Beecher, here to announce that our pages will be open to a continuance of his discussion in a future No., when he proposes to present a large class of additional facts, which he regards as essential to the full power of his argument, which being moral and cumulative, a comprehensive view of the whole seems necessary to a full perception of the force of its parts.

21.—A New Work on Geology.

We are informed by the publishers, J. S. & C. Adams, Amherst, Mass, that they have in the press, and will shortly publish, a work on Geology, by Prof. Hitchcock. The plan of the work, we understand, is novel and original, and that, while it is designed as a text-book for the Professor's own classes in Geology, and also to present to the public a condensed view of the present state of Geological facts, theories and hypotheses, it will also embrace the materials of the author's Synopsis of Geology, to be appended to his final Report on the Geology of Massachusetts, which is also now in the press.

THE

AMERICAN

BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

OCTOBER, 1840.

SECOND SERIES, NO. VIII.—WHOLE NO. XL.

ARTICLE I.

The Jordan and its Valley.

By Edward Robinson, D. D., Prof. of Bib. Lit. in the Union Theol. Sem. New-York.

Introductory Note by the Editors.

As introductory to the present article, the attention of the reader is directed to the "Brief Report," by Prof. Robinson, of his "Travels in Palestine," etc. in 1838, accompanied by the Rev. Eli Smith, which was published in the Repository for April, 1839. In that Report, (pp. 419, 420,) the writer gives a very brief account of the "Jordan and its Valley," which has since been brought into some discussion in the newspapers. Its authority has been appealed to by Mr. Buckingham in confirmation of his own account of the exceeding fertility of the Valley of the Jordan, and also to discredit the statements of Mr. Smith on the same subject, which appeared, some time since, in the New-York Observer. The single passage quoted by Mr. Buckingham, however, when read in its connections, affords no support to his representations, but is quite confirmatory of the statements of Mr. Smith. The passage, therefore, needs no defence, from us, against the use to which it has been perverted by Mr. B. Yet the interest which has been awakened in the subject by the discussions referred to, it is presumed, will render a more accurate and full description of the Jordan highly acceptable to our readers. On this account, in part, but mainly on account of the intrinsic interest of the subject, we have great satisfaction in committing to our pages

the following additional statements of Dr. Robinson, which were prepared several months since, but have been necessarily delayed.

In the passage referred to, in his former Report, it is manifest that the writer was speaking cursorily, and without regard to scientific exactness. He was accordingly guided, in some measure, by his remembrance of the language of the English Bible. In the present communication he reports accurately the results of his own observations in company with Mr. Smith, together with what has been ascertained by other travellers, not forgetting the account formerly given by Mr. Buckingham himself.—Editors.

Saturday, May 12th, 1838.—We had come this morning from our encampment on the cliffs over 'Ain Terabeh on the western coast of the Dead Sea. At 12 o'clock we were directly opposite the northwest corner of the sea, proceeding on our way towards the village Eriha, the modern representative of the ancient Jericho.

The earth as we advanced was in many places white with a nitrous crust; and we picked up occasionally small lumps of pure sulphur, of the size of a nutmeg or walnut. In some parts the surface was damp, so that the horses slipped; in others it was more like ashes, and they sunk in at every step. We now found that we still had enough of the day left to pay a visit to the Jordan before going to Jericho; and as this would be a great saving of time, and we should thereby avoid the inconvenience of an escort from the garrison, we determined to take this course. On proposing it to our guides, some of the younger ones hesitated for fear of robbers; but the sheikh assented at once. We therefore turned more to the right for a time; and then proceeded about N. E. by E. This brought us at 12. 30′ into the midst of a thicket of shrubs and canes around the northernmost point of the sea, watered by another brackish fountain called 'Ain Jehâir. On the flats and shoals along the shore in this part, there is in summer a deposit of salt, as at Birket el-Khulîl beyond 'Ain Jidy. We were soon clear of the thicket; and at 12. 45′ crossed a small sluggish stream of salt water running through marshy ground towards the sea.

Beyond this point the plain assumed a new character. All traces of vegetation ceased, except occasionally a lone sprig of the Hubeibeh or alkaline plant which we had seen at 'Ain Jidy. The surface was almost a dead level, covered with a thin smooth nitrous crust, through which the feet of men and horses broke and sunk as in ashes up to the ankles. The tract continued of this character, with a few gentle swells, until we reached the banks of the Jordan at 1. 40′, at a ford called el-Helu, considerably below the place usually visited by the pilgrims and travellers. It is indeed the lowest ford upon the river.

The upper or outer banks of the Jordan, where we thus came upon it, are not more than one hundred rods apart; with a descent of fifty or sixty feet to the level of the lower valley in which the river flows. There was here no sign of vegetation along the upper banks, nor in the valley below; except a narrow strip of canes along the brink of the channel on each side, intermingled occasionally with tamarisks and the species of willow called by the Arabs Rishrâsh, the *Agnus castus* of botanists; from which the pilgrims usually carry away branches for staves, after dipping them in the Jordan. Looking down upon the river from the high upper bank, it seemed a deep sluggish discolored stream winding its way slowly through a cane-brake. Higher up the river, we could see that the upper banks were further apart, and the border of vegetation much broader, with many trees.* We descended the high outer bank some rods above the ford; but found it impossible to reach the channel at that point, partly on account of the thickness of the cane-brake, and partly because the stream was now swollen, filling its banks to the brim, and in some places slightly overflowing them so as to cover the bottom of the brake. At this point, and as far as we could see, this strip of vegetation occupied a still lower part of the lower valley, being skirted by low

* Among the trees and shrubs higher up are said to be the Rhamnus (Nûbk) and Oleander. Hasselq. p. 152. Buckingham, p. 315.—Jacob de Vitry speaks of the canes growing along the Jordan as used for building huts; they are so used at the present day. "Et ripas idoneas ad arundines seu cannas procreandas, ex quibus tecta domorum tegunt, et parietes contexunt;" c. 53, p. 1076.

banks two or three feet high. So that here the river might strictly be said to have three sets of banks, viz. the upper or outer ones, forming the first descent from the level of the great valley; the lower or middle ones enclosing the tract of vegetation; and the actual banks of the channel.

We proceeded therefore to the place of the ford, where there was an opening through the canes and trees. Here the banks of the channel were broken or worn away for the convenience of passing, and were now covered by the water. There was a still though very rapid current; the water was of a clayey color, but sweet and delightfully refreshing after the water to which we had been confined for the last two days since leaving 'Ain Jidy—either rain-water standing in holes in the Wadies and full of animalculæ, or the brackish waters of 'Ain el-Feshkhah. I estimated the breadth of the stream to be from 80 to 100 feet; my companion notes it at from 30 to 40 yards. The guides supposed it to be now 10 or 12 feet deep. I bathed in the river, without going out into the deep channel; the bottom here (a hollow place in the bank) was clayey mud with also blue clay. I waded out ten or twelve feet, and thus far the water was not over the hips; but a little further, several of the party who swam across, found it suddenly beyond their depth. The current was so strong that even our servant Komeh, a stout swimmer of the Nile, was carried down several yards in crossing. At this time, of course, this ford was impassable for animals except by swimming; and the Aga of Jericho afterwards told us, that he was accustomed to swim his horse in crossing higher up.

The sand hills, which here form the upper banks, are of the same naked character as the desert we had crossed in coming to this spot. From them we could distinguish, some miles higher up the river, the ruined convent of St. John the Baptist, standing upon the brow of the upper bank, or first descent from the plain, near the place where the Latin pilgrims bathe in the Jordan. The Arabs call it Kŭsr el-Yehûd, 'Jews' Castle.' The bathing-place of the Greek pilgrims is two or three miles below the convent; yet each party claims to bathe at the spot where our Lord was baptized by John. Far in the north a sharp conical peak was seen standing out like a bastion from the western mountains; our Arabs called it Kŭrn Sŭrtŭbeh. Opposite to us across

the river lay the plains of Moab; the eastern mountains here retire in a small arc of a circle, forming a sort of recess, and leaving the eastern plain much broader than in any other part. It is apparently covered with shrubs, especially towards the mountains, which seemed to be two or three miles distant. Just below the ford, the Wady Hesbân comes in from the same mountains, descending through a verdant region at their foot, which indeed owes its fertility to the Wady. Further north, the similar Wady Sha'ib comes down from the vicinity of es-Salt, and enters the Jordan nearly east of Jericho. At its mouth is the ordinary ford of the river.—From the high bank near the ford, Jebelez-Salt or Gilead bore N. 30° E., Kŭsr el-Yehûd N., Kŭrn Sŭrtŭbeh N. 8° W., 'Ain es-Sultân beyond Jericho, about N. 50° W., Kŭsr Hajla N. 70° W.

The present Arabic name for the Jordan is esh-Sheriât, 'the watering-place;' to which the epithet *el-Kebîr*, 'the great,' is sometimes annexed.* The form *el-Urdan*, however, was not unknown among Arabian writers † The common name of the great valley through which it thus flows below the lake of Tiberias, is *el-Ghôr*, signifying a depressed tract or plain, usually between two mountains; and the same name continues to be applied to the valley quite across the whole length of the Dead Sea and for some distance beyond.‡

It has so happened, that until the present century most pilgrims and travellers have visited the valley of the Jordan only at Jericho; so that we have had no account of the features of its upper part in the vicinity of the lake of Tiberias. Of the earlier pilgrims indeed, Antoninus Martyr at the

---

* To distinguish it from the Sheriât el-Mandhûr or Yarmûk, the ancient Hieromax, which joins it from the east about two hours below the lake of Tiberias. Burckhardt, pp. 273, 274. Edrisi ed. Jaubert, p. 338. Abulfed. Tab. Syr. p. 148.

† Abulfedae Tab. Syr. p. 147. Schultens Index in vit. Saladin, art. *Fluvius Jordanes.*

‡ It thus corresponds to the *Auton* of Eusebius and Jerome; see Onomast.—On the Ghôr, see Edrisi par Jaubert, pp. 337, 338. Abulfedae Tab. Syr. ed. Kohler, pp. 8, 9. Schultens Index in Vit. Salad. art. *Algaurum.* Reland Palaest. p. 365. Abulfedae says correctly that the same valley extends to Ailah.

close of the sixth century, and St. Willibald in the eighth, passed down through the whole length of the valley from Tiberias to Jericho; and in the year 1100 King Baldwin I. accompanied a train of pilgrims from Jericho to Tiberias;* but we have nothing more than a mere notice of these journeys. In like manner the various excursions of the crusaders across the Ghôr throw no light upon its character. In the year 1799 the French penetrated to the south end of the lake of Tiberias, but no further. In 1806 Seetzen crossed the valley just south of the same lake; but describes it only in very general terms.† Burckhardt in 1812 was twice in its northern part; and travelled along it from Beisân to a point several hours below, on his way to es-Salt.‡ Six years later, in the winter of 1818, Irby and Mangles passed down from Tiberias to Beisân; thence crossed over into the country around Jerash, and returned from es-Salt to Nâbulus, fording the Jordan several miles above Jericho.§ About the same time Mr. Bankes, accompanied by Buckingham, crossed the valley obliquely from Jericho, passing the river apparently at the same ford (or very near it) as Irby and Mangles.‖

According to Burckhardt, the Ghôr at the upper end runs in a course from N. by E. to S. by W., and is about two hours broad.¶ Opposite Jericho we found its general course to be the same; but in consequence of the retiring of the mountains on both sides, to which I have already alluded, its breadth is here much greater, being not less than three and a half or four hours. The Jordan issues from the lake of Tiberias near its S. W. corner, where are still traces of the site and walls of the ancient Tarichaea.** The river at first winds very much, and flows for three hours near the western hills; then turns to the eastern, on which side it continues its course for several hours, to the district called

---

* Fulcher. Carnot. 21, p. 402.

† Zach's Manatl. Corresp. XVIII. p. 350.

‡ Travels, etc. pp. 274, 344, seq.

§ Travels, pp. 300—305, 326.

‖ Buckingham's Travels in Palest. p. 313, seq.

¶ Page 344.

** Seetzen, l. c. p. 350. Irby and Mangles, p. 300. See Reland's Palest. p. 1026. Comp. Pocoke, II. p. 70, fol.

Kŭrn el-Hemâr, 'Ass's Horn,' two hours below Beisân; where it again returns to the western side of the valley.* Lower down the Jordan follows more the middle of the great valley; though opposite Jericho and towards the Dead Sea, its course is nearer to the eastern mountains; about two thirds or three quarters of the valley lying here upon its western side. A few hundred yards below the point where the Jordan issues from the lake, there is a ford, close by the ruins of a Roman bridge of ten arches.† About two hours further down are the ruins of another bridge, called Iisr el-Mejami, consisting of one arch in the centre with small arches upon arches at the sides; and also a ruined Khân upon the western bank.‡ Somewhat higher up, but in sight of these ruins, is another ford.§ That near Beisân lies in a direction S. S. E. from the town.‖ Indeed, "the river is fordable in many places during summer; but the few spots where it may be crossed in the rainy season are known only to the Arabs."¶

The banks of the Jordan appear to preserve everywhere a uniform character, such as we have described them above. "The river flows in a valley of about a quarter of an hour in breadth, [sometimes more and sometimes less,] which is considerably lower than the rest of the Ghôr;" in the northern part about forty feet.** This lower valley, where Burckhardt saw it, was "covered with high trees and a luxuriant verdure, affording a striking contrast with the sandy slopes that border it on both sides." Further down, a portion of this lower valley is also naked sand; and the verdure is confined (in some parts at least) to a still lower strip along the river's brink. So we saw it; and so also it is described by Pococke near the convent of St. John.††

* Burckhardt, pp. 344, 345. Irby and Mangles, l. c.

† Irby and Mangles, pp. 296, 301.

‡ Ibid. p. 301. Seetzen, l. c. p. 351.

§ Buckingham, l. c. 448. Burckhardt, p. 275.

‖ Burckhardt, p. 344.

¶ Ibid. p. 345.

** Ibid. pp. 344, 345.

†† "From the high bank indeed of the river, [meaning the usual level of the lower valley,] there is a descent in many places to a lower ground, which is four or five feet above the water, and is frequently covered with wood;" Pocoke II. p. 33, fol.

The channel of the river varies in different places; being in some wider and more shallow, and in others narrower and deeper. At the ford near Beisân on the 12th of March, Irby and Mangles found the breadth to be one hundred and forty feet by measure; the stream was swift and reached above the bellies of the horses. When Burckhardt passed here in July, it was about three feet deep.* On the return of the former travellers twelve days later, (March 25th,) they found the river at a lower ford extremely rapid, and were obliged to swim their horses.† On the 29th of January in the same year, as Mr. Bankes crossed at or near the same lower ford, the stream is described as flowing rapidly over a bed of pebbles, but as easily fordable for the horses.‡ Near the convent of St. John, the stream at the annual visit of the pilgrims at Easter is sometimes said to be narrow and flowing six feet below the banks of its channel.§ At the Greek bathing place lower down, it is described in 1815 on the 3d of May, as rather more than fifty feet wide and five feet deep, running with a violent current; in some other parts it was very deep.‖

These are the most definite notices which I have been able to find respecting the Jordan and its channel; and I have collected them here, because they have a bearing on another question of some interest, viz. the annual rise and supposed regular overflow of the waters of the river. It is indeed generally assumed that the Jordan of old, somewhat like the Nile, regularly overflowed its banks in the spring, covering with its waters the whole of its lower valley, and perhaps sometimes large tracts of the broad Ghôr itself.** It seems however to be generally admitted, that no such extensive inundation takes place at the present day; and all the testimony above adduced goes to establish the same fact. It is therefore supposed that some change must have taken place, either because the channel has been worn deeper than

---

* Irby and Mangles, p. 304. Burckhardt, p. 345.

† Travels, pp. 304, 326.

‡ Buckingham, l. c. p. 315.

§ Maundrell, March 30th. Hasselquist Reis. p. 152.

‖ Turner's Tour, etc. II. p. 224.

** Reland's Palest. p. 273. Bachiene I. p. 140, seq. Raumer's Palaest. p. 61, ed. 2.

formerly, or because the waters have been diminished or diverted.* But although at present a smaller quantity of rain may fall in Palestine than anciently, in consequence of the destruction of the woods and forests, yet I apprehend that even the ancient rise of the river has been greatly exaggerated. The sole accounts we have of the annual increase of its waters, are found in the earlier scriptural history of the Israelites; where, according to the English Version, the Jordan is said to "overflow all its banks" in the first month, or all the time of harvest.† But the original Hebrew expresses in these passages nothing more, than that the Jordan "was full (or filled) up to all its banks," meaning the banks of its channel; it ran with full banks, or was brimfull. The same sense is given by the Septuagint and Vulgate.‡

Thus understood the Biblical account corresponds precisely to what we find to be the case at the present day. The Israelites crossed the Jordan four days before the passover (Easter) which they afterwards celebrated at Gilgal on the fourteenth day of the first month.§ Then, as now, the harvest occurred during April and early in May, the barley preceding the wheat-harvest by two or three weeks. Then, as now, there was an annual rise of the river, which caused it to flow at this season with full banks, and sometimes to spread its waters even over the low banks of its channel so as to fill the tract covered with trees and vegetation along its sides.‖ Further than this there is no evidence that its

* Maundrel, March 30th.

† Josh. iii. 15. 1 Chron. xii. 15. The only other allusion to a rise of the Jordan in harvest, is in Eccles. xxiv. 26 or 36; where, however, an inundation is not necessarily implied.—The phrase "swelling of Jordan," English version, Jer. xii. 5, xlix. 19, l. 44, should be rendered "pride of Jordan," as in Zech. xi. 3, where the original word is the same, referring to the verdure and thickets of its banks. The phrase has no allusion to a rise of its waters.

‡ Heb. מָלֵא [מְמַלֵּא] עַל-כָּל-גְּדוֹתָיו. Sept. ἐπλήρου καθ' ὅλην τὴν κρηπίδα αὐτοῦ. Vulg. "Jordanis autem ripas alvei sui tempore messis impleverat." Luther also gives the same sense correctly: "Der Jordan aber war vollanallen seinen Ufern."

§ Josh. iv. 19; v. 10.

‖ Burckhardt says loosely, that the Jordan in winter (meaning generally the rainy season) "inundates the plain in the

inundations have ever extended; indeed the very fact of their having done so, would in this soil and climate necessarily have carried back the line of vegetation to a greater distance from the channel. Did the Jordan, like the Nile, spread out its waters over a wide region, they would no doubt everywhere produce the same lavish fertility.

Although therefore the Jordan probably never pours its flood beyond the limits of its green borders, yet it is natural to suppose that the amount of its rise must vary in different years, according to the variable quantity of rain which may annually fall. This consideration will account in a great measure for the various reports and estimates of travellers. It may also appear singular, that this annual rise should take place near the close of the rainy season, or even after it, rather than at an earlier period, when the rains are heaviest. This is sometimes referred to the late melting of the snows on Jebel esh-Sheikh or Hermon;* but at this season these snows have usually long been melted, and only the mighty head of Hermon is decked with an icy crown. The fact however may be easily explained, I apprehend, upon ordinary principles.

In the first place, the heavy rains of November and December find the earth in a parched and thirsty state; and among the loose limestone rocks and caverns of Palestine a far greater proportion of the water is under these circumstances absorbed, than is usual in occidental countries, where rains are frequent. Then too the course of the Jordan below the lake of Tiberias is comparatively short; no living streams enter it from the mountains, except the Yarmûk and the Zûrka from the east; and the smaller torrents from the hills would naturally, at the most, produce but a sudden and temporary rise. Whether such an effect does actually take place, we are not informed; as no traveller has yet seen the Jordan during the months of November and December. Late in January and early in March, 1818, as we have seen, nothing of the kind was perceptible.

But a more important and perhaps the chief cause of the

---

bottom of the narrow valley." But this whole lower plain, where he saw it, was "covered with high trees and a luxuriant verdure." Travels, etc. pp. 344, 345.

* Bachiene I. p. 141.

phenomenon, lies (I apprehend) in the general conformation of the region through which the Jordan flows. The rains which descend upon Anti-Lebanon and the mountains around the upper part of the Jordan, and which might be expected to produce sudden and violent inundations, are received into the basins of the Hûleh and the lake of Tiberias, and there spread out over a broad surface; so that all violence is destroyed, and the stream that issues from them can only flow with a regulated current, varying in depth according to the elevation of the lower lake. These lakes indeed may be compared to great regulators, which control the violence of the Jordan, and prevent its inundations. The principle is precisely the same, (though on a far inferior scale,) as that which prevents the sudden rise and overflow of the magnificent streams connecting the great lakes of North America.—As now the lake of Tiberias reaches its highest level at the close of the rainy season, the Jordan naturally flows with its fullest current for some time after that period; and as the rise of the lake naturally varies (like that of the Dead Sea) in different years, so also the fulness of the Jordan.

All these circumstances,—the low bed of the river, the absence of inundation and of tributary streams,—combine to leave the greater portion of the Ghôr a solitary desert. Such it is described in antiquity, and such we find it at the present day. Josephus speaks of the Jordan as flowing "through a desert;" and of this plain as in summer scorched by heat, insalubrious, and watered by no stream except the Jordan.* The portion of it which we had thus far crossed has already been described; and we afterwards had opportunity to overlook it for a great distance towards the north, where it retained the same character. Near the ford five or six miles above Jericho, the plain is described as "generally unfertile, the soil being in many places incrusted with salt, and having small heaps of a white powder, like sulphur, scattered at short intervals over its surface;" here too the bottom of the lower valley is generally barren.† In the

* Josep. B. J. iii. 107.—In a similar sense Jerome, Comm. in Zech. xi. 3, "Sic Jordani fluvio ... fremitum junxit leonum propter ardorem sitis, et ob deserti viciniam et latitudinem vastae solitudinis et arundineta et carecto."

† Buckingham l. c. pp. 313, 314.

northern part of the Ghôr, according to Burckhardt, "the great number of rivulets which descend from the mountains on both sides, and form numerous pools of stagnant water, produce in many places a pleasing verdure, and a luxuriant growth of wild herbage and grass; but the greater part of the ground is a parched desert, of which a few spots only are cultivated by the Bedâwîn."* So too in the southern part, where similar rivulets or fountains exist, as around Jericho, there is an exuberant fertility; but these seldom reach the Jordan, and have no effect upon the middle of the Ghôr. Nor are the mountains upon each side less rugged and desolate than they have been described along the Dead Sea. The western cliffs overhang the valley at an elevation of 1000 or 1200 feet; while the eastern mountains are indeed at first less lofty and precipitous, but rise further back into ranges from 2000 to 2500 feet in height.

Such is the Jordan and its valley; that venerated stream, celebrated on almost every page of the Old Testament as the border of the Promised Land, whose floods were miraculously "driven back" to afford a passage for the Israelites. In the New Testament, it is still more remarkable for the baptism of our Saviour, when the heavens were opened, and the Spirit of God descended upon him, "and lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son!"† We now stood upon its shores, and had bathed in its waters, and felt ourselves surrounded by hallowed associations. The exact places of these and other events connected with this part of the Jordan, it is in vain to seek after; nor is this necessary in order to awaken and fully to enjoy all the emotions, which the region around is adapted to inspire.

As to the passage of the Israelites, the pilgrims of course regard it as having occurred near the places where they bathe or not far below. Mistaken piety seems early to have fixed upon the spot, and erected a church, and set up the twelve stones near to the supposed site of Gilgal, five miles from the Jordan. This is described by Arculfus at the close of the seventh, and by St. Willibald in the eighth century; and the twelve stones are still mentioned by Rudolph de Suchem in the fourteenth.‡ In later times, Irby and

* Travels, etc. p. 344. † Matt. iii. 13, seq.

‡ Adamnanus ex. Arculfo II. 14, 15. St. Willibaldi Hodoep. 18. Rud. de Such. in Reyseb. des h. Landes, p. 849.

Mangles remark that "it would be interesting to search for the twelve stones" near the ford where they crossed some distance above Jericho.* But the circumstances of the scriptural narrative, I apprehend, do not permit us to look so high up; nor indeed for any particular ford or point, except for the passage of the ark. "The waters that came down from above, stood, and rose up upon a heap, . . . and those that came down towards the sea . . . failed and were cut off; and the people passed over *right against* Jericho."† That is, the waters above being held back, those below flowed off and left the channel towards the Dead Sea dry; so that the people, amounting to more than two millions of souls, were not confined to a single point, but could pass over any part of the empty channel directly from the plains of Moab towards Jericho.

ARTICLE II.

The Primitive State of Mankind.

An attempt to prove that the original or most ancient condition of the human family was CIVILIZED *and not* SAVAGE.

By Philip Lindsley, D. D., President of Nashville University, Tennessee.

Few subjects have given rise to more crude and unphilosophical speculation than the *primeval state* of mankind. That state is universally represented to have been, either comparatively rude and barbarous, or absolutely wild and savage. Almost the whole of our reading, whether of history, poetry or philosophy, has a tendency to create and to confirm this prejudice. So that we generally take the fact for granted without any investigation; and are fully persuaded of it before we condescend to canvass the logic by which it is so elaborately supported by its numerous advocates. That the Greek and Roman sophists should have

---

* Travels, p. 326. So too Buckingham, p. 315.

† Josh. iii. 16.

entertained such a notion, or that the ignorant and self-sufficient freethinker of modern times should be no wiser, is not greatly to be wondered at. But that any enlightened Christian,—much more, that a Christian philosopher or theologian should be found laboring in behalf of the same doctrine, is truly matter of astonishment and humiliation.

The pride of system frequently leads very ingenious men into extravagancies on this, as upon other subjects. It is difficult, indeed, to avoid extremes when we enlist our feelings, as well as our reason, in favor of any theory. But here we are peculiarly liable to err. Nature herself, in all her operations, utters a language and exhibits facts calculated to mislead us. All animals, with which we are acquainted, commence their existence in a comparatively weak and helpless condition. Every thing in the vegetable kingdom is subject to a similar law. The stateliest oak in the forest has been an embryo in the acorn. The lion and the elephant might once have been crushed beneath the feeblest hand. Every man *now* living has been an infant; and whether the inmate of a palace or a cottage, he was once a debtor to the anxious and constant care of others for the preservation of his life, and to their instruction for the elements of whatever knowledge he possesses. The rule is universal. It has no exceptions. It is certain even, that no mortal would ever speak, or contrive a language, were he to receive no assistance from others; or were he to be totally excluded from social intercourse, so as never to have it in his power to *imitate* articulate sounds.

Thus, then, from analogy, we are led to contemplate the primitive state of man as similar to that of infancy. We are prone to regard the beginnings of all things as small, and feeble, and rude. We always suppose *time* to be necessary to impart vigor, and beauty, and magnitude, and maturity. States and empires have grown up to power and splendor through years of discipline, and effort, and struggle. Individuals make great literary and scientific attainments in the same manner. And can it be presumed that what is *now* true of every man, and of every association of men, was not true of him in his original or first condition?

Admitting that all men are descended from a common ancestry, why should we suppose that the first families were wiser and more ingenious, more improved and cultivated,

than millions of their posterity are, at this moment, known to be? Have not men been found in a *savage* state in every age of the world, to which authentic history extends? How could men lose a knowledge of the arts—especially of the useful arts—and degenerate into savages, if their forefathers had ever been civilized and enlightened?

These and many similar inquiries may, we think, be satisfactorily answered, without at all countenancing the hypothesis upon which they have been grounded.

The savage state was not the *primeval* state of man. If it had been, man would have remained a savage to this day. There is no proof that any nation, or society, or tribe, or family, or individual has ever advanced to a state of civilization without the aid and instruction of those who were previously civilized. There is abundant proof to the contrary.

We propose to establish and to illustrate the following proposition, namely:

Man has ever been a civilized being. Such was he created, and such do we find him in every age.* The stream of civilization can be traced back from one period and country and nation to another, till we arrive at the original fountain in that paradise of beauty and innocence in which man first awoke to the praises of his Maker and to the healthful exercise of all his faculties.

Reason, Revelation and History confirm this view of the subject.

I. Reason. Does not reason tell us that man must have been created, at some period or other, by an almighty, independent, all-wise and beneficent Deity? If so—and every other hypothesis would land us in atheism and absurdity—does not reason intimate that a Creator, infinitely wise, good and powerful, would, at the first, have endowed man with all the faculties, moral, intellectual and corporeal, in such a state of maturity, and with such an aptitude to every exercise and pursuit and attainment, as his distinguished rank

* Not everywhere, indeed; but somewhere—in some part of the world. So that there never has been a period of time, however brief, when civilized man could nowhere be found upon the earth.

among the creatures of God, and his high destiny seemed to require?

Was man designed to be the representative of Deity in this lower world—the lord of creation—the absolute sovereign over all the other animals—the undisputed master of all the riches upon the earth: and can it be that he should have been ushered into the midst of all this vast and varied inheritance, without one qualification for its proper management or enjoyment?—in fact, unconscious of what he was, or of what he was destined to become?—without language, and ignorant that he possessed the capacity of inventing or acquiring any?—without arts, and with fewer instincts than other animals?—in a word, a mere brute, and of the meanest, most miserable, and most helpless order? Would not a constant miracle have been necessary for the protection and sustenance of such a creature? Does *reason* then furnish any plausible support to such a theory? Does she not at once pronounce it incredible—impossible?

We are aware that we have presented, what may be thought, an extreme case;—that we have supposed a state of savageness, or rather of brutality, much worse than is generally contended for. It may be worse than what would suit the notions of some; but not so bad but that we may readily find for it many ingenious and confident advocates.

Diodorus Siculus, in the beginning of his history, says that men at first lived dispersed like the beasts, in caves and woods, and subsisted upon the natural productions of the earth; that they had no use of speech, and uttered only inarticulate cries; but that having herded together from fear of the wild beasts, they invented a language, and imposed names upon things. [*Diod. Lib.* I. *cap.* 8.]

The Epicureans, it is well known, held the same doctrine. Lucretius, a distinguished poet and philosopher of this famous school, in his fifth book, *De Rerum Natura*, describes the primitive state of our race very minutely and accurately, according to the system of his sect. After telling us how men lived in the woods and mountains, without the use of fire, he adds:

> "Nec commune bonum poterant spectare, nec ullis
> Moribus inter se scibant, nec legibus uti.
> Quod cuique obtulerat prædæ fortuna, ferebat,
> Sponte sua, sibi quisque valere et vivere doctus."

After which, he proceeds to relate how men associated together, which he ascribes chiefly to the fear of wild beasts, and how they built huts, discovered the use of fire, and reared families. Even this, however, would not have sufficed to the ultimate preservation of the race:

> "At varios linguæ sonitus Natura subegit
> Mittere, et Utilitas expressit nomina rerum."

So that, according to Lucretius, language was invented by men, after they had associated together, and made some progress towards civilization.

This system appears to have been very popular at Rome, during the brightest period of her literature and philosophy. Horace, one of the best of her poets, and reputed a philosopher of no ordinary character, and belonging to the same school with Lucretius, has these remarkable lines: [*Sat.* 3, *Lib.* I.]

> "Cum prorepserunt primis animalia terris,
> Mutum et turpe pecus, glandem atque cubilia propter,
> Unguibus et pugnis, dein fustibus, atque ità porro
> Pugnabant armis, quæ post fabricaverat usus;
> Donec verba, quibus voces sensusque notarent,
> Nominaque invenêre: dehinc absistere bello,
> Oppida cœperunt munire, et ponere leges,
> Ne quis fur esset, neu latro, neu quis adulter."

And Cicero, [*De Inventione Rhetorica, Lib.* I. *c.* 2,] asserts the same doctrine. "Nam fuit quoddam tempus, cum in agris homines passim bestiarum modo vagabantur, et sibi victu ferino vitam propagabant; nec ratione animi quidquam, sed pleraque viribus corporis administrabant. Nondum divinæ religionis, non humani officii ratio colebatur: nemo nuptias viderat legitimas: non certos quisquam inspexerat liberos: non jus æquabile quid utilitatis haberet, acceperat." Again, [*De Legibus. Lib.* 2, *c.* 14,] speaking of the Eleusinian mysteries, he says: "Nam mihi cùm multa eximia divinaque videntur Athenæ tuæ peperisse, atque in vita hominum attulisse, tum nihil melius illis mysteriis, quibus ex agresti immanique vita exculti ad humanitatem, et mitigati sumus."

Thus also, Juvenal: [*Sat.* 15, *V.* 147, *etc.*]

> * * * * "Mundi
> Principio indulsit communis conditor illis
> Tantum animas, nobis animum quoque; mutuus ut nos

Affectus petere auxilium, et præstare juberet,
Dispersos trahere in populum, migrare vetusto
De nemore, et proavis habitatas linquere sylvas;
Ædificare domos, laribus conjungere nostris
Tectum aliud, tutos vicino limine somnos
Ut collata daret fiducia; protegere armis
Lapsum, aut ingenti nutantem vulnere civem:
Communi dare signa tubâ defendier isdem
Turribus, atque una portarum clave teneri."

Nor is his account of the golden age much more flattering. (See *Satire* 6, at the beginning, etc.)

"Credo pudicitiam Saturno rege moratam
In terris, visamque diu; cùm frigida parvas
Præberet spelunca domos, ignemque, Laremque,
Et pecus, et dominos communi clauderet umbrâ:
Sylvestrem montana torum cùm sterneret uxor
Frondibus et culmo, vicinarumque ferarum
Pellibus: haud similis tibi, Cynthia, nec tibi, cujus
Turbavit nitidos extinctus passer ocellos:
Sed polanda ferens infantibus ubera magnis,
Et sæpè horridior glandem ructante marito."

It is unnecessary to quote many authorities on this subject. The truth is, that a similar train of sentiment seems to pervade the philosophy and the mythology of the classic ages. We meet with it in the theology of the early Christian fathers. And among modern writers, whether Christian or infidel, it would be difficult to enumerate all who have professedly or incidentally advocated or countenanced the same system. "The greater part of modern philosophers (says one of them) have declared for the original *savageism* of men."*

* As specimens of the several classes of authors who have, in their various works, insinuated or assumed or distinctly enunciated the same doctrine, the following names may be cited: viz. Hobbes, Rousseau, Hume, Condorcet, Buffon, Kaimes, White, Robertson, Gillies, Shaftesbury, Russell, Voltaire, Raynal, Millot, Astle, Darwin, Condillac, Adam Smith, Gibbon, Maupertuis, Michaelis, Volney, Tytler, Priestley, Mallet, Heeren, Klaproth, Ferguson. See more especially, Goguet's "*Origin of Laws, Arts and Sciences, and their Progress among the most Ancient Nations:*—Gebelin's "*Monde Primitif, analysé et comparé avec Le Monde Moderne;*" and that most ingenious of all philological romances, the "*History of the European Languages,*" by the late Alexander Mur-

Passing, therefore, a multitude of names, we proceed to pay our respects to its most distinguished champion among the philosophers of the last century. In that very learned, elaborate, and, in many respects, ingenious treatise, on "the Origin and Progress of Language," by the late celebrated James Burnett, afterwards Lord Monboddo, of Scotland, we have a complete development of the old Epicurean theory, in all its most repulsive features. The learned author intended no caricature, but a beautiful and finished picture. He was an enthusiast in the cause; but yet cool, collected, and persevering in his investigations of all the stores of ancient and modern learning, and of all the facts with which he could become acquainted. It is true, that, like most other honest, candid, unprejudiced inquirers after truth, he set out upon his researches, or voyage of discovery, with his mind made up — with his system already formed; —and, of course, he readily enough met with materials adapted to his purpose, quite sufficient to eke out a very plausible case; and, in his own view at least, to operate perfect conviction upon all the *ethereal* spirits capable of comprehending him. But, let the philosopher speak for himself: "I cannot doubt (says he) but that I shall convince every one who will think it worth his while to read what follows, that articulation is altogether the work of art, at least of a habit acquired by custom and exercise, and that we are truly by nature the *mutum pecus*, the mute herd, that Horace makes us to be. This, I think, I am able to prove, both from *theory* and facts." (Vol. I. p. 185.)

We shall not accompany him through his curious details of facts, derived from ancient historians and from modern voyagers and travellers; the *fish eaters*, the *wood-eaters*, the

---

ray, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, &c. in the University of Edinburgh. The whole current of our periodical literature is in a similar vein. Thus, in the first volume of the Classical Journal (page 41) the late Professor R. Scott, of Aberdeen, treating "*of the origin and progress of language and writing*," commences a paragraph as follows: "As language must at first have been the invention of rude and unenlightened men, very little raised above the state of barbarism, it may appear to some of my readers very difficult to comprehend how such men should have been capable of exercising that degree of abstraction, which the formation of its mere elements implies."

insensibles of Diodorus Siculus; the *Troglodytes* of Herodotus; the *Bornians* of Leo Africanus; and the thousands of brutish hordes of savages and cannibals, reported to have existed or as still existing in America, in Africa, in New Holland, and in the islands of the great Pacific Ocean: all of which the author carefully marshals and arrays in support of his theory. He avails himself too, with great skill, of the opinions of eminent writers, ancient and modern, whenever they seemed to favor his own. We say *seemed;* for he sometimes appears to have decided rather hastily, or he could never have dragged Plato and Warburton into his ranks;—men who, though they did not entertain, what we deem, orthodox sentiments on this subject, yet differed widely from his Lordship in the main features of his scheme.

After thus citing a host of facts and authorities, to prove that men are allied to the *Simian* tribes—that man and the monkey belong to the same species—and are no otherwise to be distinguished from each other than by circumstances, which can be accounted for by the different physical and moral agencies to which they have been exposed, he very modestly adds: "This opinion, therefore, of mine may be false; but it is not new nor singular; and being supported by such respectable authorities, I may say the concurring testimony of all ancient authors who have treated the subject, is, I think, entitled to a fair and candid examination, which, however, it cannot expect from vulgar prejudice, but only from men of liberal thought, and more than common learning; and it is for such only that I write." The author did not here mean to intimate that he himself entertained a shadow of doubt on the subject. On the contrary, he fully believed every thing that he has advanced. "The orang-outangs (says he) are proved to be of our species by marks of humanity that I think are incontestable." (*Ibid.* p. 375.)

Now although his Lordship has exposed himself to much ridicule for having thus gratuitously provided his ancestors with *tails*, and has thereby brought his system somewhat into disrepute, yet we cannot help thinking that he has pursued quite as logical and philosophical a course as others have done, who, commencing with the same general premises, have yet stopped short of the same pleasant results. He has accomplished in this department of science what Berkley and Hume effected in metaphysics. He has reasoned con-

sistently upon false, but hitherto almost undisputed principles. He has arrived, by a legitimate process of induction and argumentation from unquestioned data, at conclusions, which shock as extravagant, or provoke laughter or pity as ridiculous or absurd. The true dignity of man, and his original character and condition, will probably be better understood and appreciated, in consequence of his learned labors to degrade him. His book may possibly open the eyes of many, who will startle at what appears monstrous, while otherwise they might not choose to suspect the soundness of commonly received dogmas.

We could as soon go all lengths with Monboddo, as subscribe to the following statement or position of Adam Ferguson, in his Essay on Civil Society: "The individual in every age, has the same race to run from infancy to manhood, and every infant or ignorant person now, is a model of what man was in his original state." He evidently intends to avoid the extravagance of the former, and of the *ultra* Epicureans, for he adds, a few pages after: "If there was a time in which he had his acquaintance with his own species to make, and his faculties to acquire, it is a time of which we have no record, and in relation to which our opinions can serve no purpose, and are supported by no evidence." This is put hypothetically. It may, or it may not have been so. We know little or nothing about the matter, according to this sagacious political philosopher and able historian.

Again, in the progress of his work, he presents us with another view of the subject, a little modified indeed, but in the main sufficiently consistent with the one already cited. "The inhabitants of Britain, at the time of the first Roman invasions, resembled, in many things, the present natives of North America; they were ignorant of agriculture, they painted their bodies, and used for clothing the skins of beasts. Such, therefore, appears to have been the commencement of history with all nations, and in such circumstances are we to look for the original character of mankind."*

---

* Ferguson's Essay on Civil Society, p. 125. See also Robertson's History of America; vol. 2. pp. 34—51, where a similar opinion is maintained. Also Millot's Ancient History, at beginning.

Dr. Beattie, speaking of the system of Epicurus, which had found so powerful an advocate in his erudite but eccentric countryman and contemporary, has the following very just observations:—"One would wonder, (says he,) what *charms* men could find in a system so degrading to our nature; or what *evidence* in that which has no other foundation, than poetical fancy and wild hypothesis. The Pagans, indeed, who knew little of the origin of mankind, might be excused for favoring an opinion, which, as it appears in Lucretius, has at least harmonious numbers and elegant description to recommend it. And yet, unseduced by poetical allurement, Quinctilian declares, in the language of true philosophy, that moral sentiments are natural to us, and that men had speech from the beginning, and received that choice gift from their Creator. And Ovid's beautiful account of the first men seems to have been composed, partly from Hesiod's golden age, and partly from traditions founded on the Mosaic history of the creation;—that we were at first good and happy, and lost our felicity when we lost our innocence.—Is it not an idea more honorable to our nature, more friendly to virtue, and more consonant to the general notions of mankind, than that we were in the beginning a species of wild beast, and afterwards by *improvement* degenerated into wicked and wretched men? If there be, in the consciousness of honorable descent, any thing that elevates the soul, surely those writings cannot be on the side of virtue which represent our nature, and our origin, as such as we should have reason to be ashamed of. But he, who tells me, upon the authority of Scripture, and agreeably to the dictates of right reason, that we were all descended from beings, who were created in the image of God, wise, innocent and happy; that, by their and our unworthy conduct, human nature is miserably degraded; but that on the performance of certain most reasonable conditions, we may retrieve our primitive dignity, and rise even to higher happiness than that of our first parents;—the man, I say, who teaches this doctrine, sets before me the most animating motives to virtue, humility and hope, to piety and benevolence, to gratitude and adoration." (*Beattie's Theory of Language, p.* 100.)

Again, he says: "We learn to speak, when our organs are most flexible, and our powers of imitation most active;

that is, when we are infants. Yet even then, this is no easy acquisition, but the effect of daily exercise continued for several years from morning to night. Were we never to attempt speech till we are grown up, there is reason to think that we should find it exceedingly difficult if not impracticable."

Mute savages have been found in deserts and forests who never could be taught to speak. In every language there are certain peculiar accents and articulate sounds which they only can pronounce with ease or accuracy, who have learned to do so when very young. "If, then, there ever was a time, when all mankind were *mutum et turpe pecus*, a dumb and brutal race of animals, all mankind must, in the ordinary course of things, have continued dumb to this day. —For, to such animals speech could not be necessary; as they are supposed to have existed for ages without it; and it is not to be imagined, that dumb and beastly savages would ever think of contriving unnecessary arts, whereof they had no example in the world around them." Further, according to Dr. Johnson: "Speech, if invented at all, must have been invented, either by children, who were incapable of invention, or by men, who were incapable of speech." "And therefore reason, as well as history, intimates that mankind in all ages must have been speaking animals; the young having constantly acquired this art by imitating those who were elder. And we may warrantably suppose, that our first parents must have received it by immediate inspiration." (*Beattie.*)

Indeed, no other account of the origin of language is rational or philosophical, or even plausible,—to say nothing of Scripture. When it is said that our first parents must have received the art of speech by immediate inspiration, it is not necessary to suppose that the Creator inspired them with any particular original or primitive language; but that he made them fully sensible of the power with which they were endued of forming articulate sounds, gave them an impulse to exert it, and left the arbitrary imposition of words to their own choice. But however this might be, we find Adam in fact, as soon as created, giving names to all animals, and holding converse with his Maker, and with his Maker's "last best gift," which alone constituted his beautiful Eden a perfect Paradise. We find him from the begin-

ning a social, domestic, speaking and religious being. Man is called by Homer *μεροψ*, or *articulate speaking;* and certainly there is no other characteristic at once more noble and more peculiarly his own.

That man, then, in his primeval state, had no affinity with any species of the brute creation—that he never was a quadruped, using his hands for feet—that he never possessed any of the ornamental or superfluous appendages peculiar to the wild beast of the forest—and that he never could have been destitute of speech or language—the physiologist, the anatomist, the historian, the philologist, the Christian divine, with several even of the ancient sages and poets, unite in attesting. "Of standing facts there ought to be no controversy," says Dr. Johnson. "If there are men with tails, catch an *homo caudatus.*" The Epicurean theory, therefore, must be surrendered as utterly indefensible upon any rational ground.

Thus far, then, authority, as well as reason and facts, will sustain our doctrine; or be found arrayed against the scheme so beautifully portrayed by Lucretius, and so speciously elaborated by Monboddo.

But the proposition, which it was our main design to demonstrate, is vastly more comprehensive. It is not enough to prove that men were not originally a *dumb* and *brutish herd.* Our object was to show that men were not originally even savages; that they were not a wild, rude and barbarous race, like the ancient Gauls and Britons, or like the present Indians of America or Negroes of Africa.*

* Dr. Blair, in his Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres, which are studied, as orthodox, wherever the English language prevails, takes for granted, throughout, that the *savage* was the primitive state of man. This is more especially apparent whenever he has occasion to trace to its origin any human art, science, invention, discovery, custom or opinion, which comes within the scope of his extensive and diversified speculations. See, in particular, his Lectures on the Rise and Progress of Language. In Lecture 38, on the nature of Poetry, he remarks: "In order to explore the rise of poetry, we must have recourse to the deserts and the wilds; we must go back to the age of hunters and of shepherds; to the highest antiquity; and to the simplest form of manners among mankind." And that we may not be left in any doubt about his

We have already suggested the presumption which Reason, *a priori*, furnishes against this still almost universally prevalent theory. The *reductio ad absurdum* will apply to the latter with scarcely less propriety and effect, than to the revolting extravagances of the Epicurean school.

The argument from Scripture and History remains yet to be exhibited.

II. Scripture. Let us then appeal to the oldest written record in the world. Read the Mosaic account of man's creation. Behold the first pair in the garden of Eden; and appointed "to dress it, and to keep it"—with "dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth."

Recollect that every thing was created in a state of perfection or maturity. All animals and vegetables were of full size and vigor. They required no time to grow. Ripe fruits were upon the trees: and every living creature was prepared at once to enter upon its destined career. Thus, too, was man created—vigorous and mature in all his faculties of body and mind; ready for every work and duty which his situation demanded; with God for his companion, friend and instructer. Horticulture was his first employment. This has never been the occupation of savage life. Hunting, then, or the chase could not have been the primitive mode of procuring a subsistence. Or, in other words, the *hunting state* is not the state of nature, or of man in his original, natural condition. And yet savages, in every age and country, have been and still are *hunters*. So that *hunting* may be assumed as a universal predicate or characteristic of savage life. Adam therefore was not a savage.

He must have been an eminent naturalist, at least zoologist, if he gave appropriate and significant names to all animals. Of his first two sons, the one was a farmer, and the other a shepherd.

Cain, the first born of the human race, built a city, and called it Enoch after his own eldest son; and, of course,

---

opinion of the most ancient condition of our race, he presently adds: "It is chiefly in America, that we have had the opportunity of being made acquainted with men in their savage state,"—i. e. with men in their original or natural state.

must have known all the arts which such an undertaking implies or requires. And that *cities* might have been very necessary, or at least very convenient, will appear sufficiently obvious, when we consider the amount of population which probably existed even at this early period. According to several profound biblical antiquaries and expositors, there might have been many hundreds of thousands. We do not vouch for the accuracy of any of the speculative calculations which have appeared upon the subject of the antediluvian population. We may be sure, however, that none of the *Malthusian* obstacles to the rapid increase of the human species, could have been pleaded by old bachelors *then* as *now*, by way of apology for disobeying one of the first, most positive, and most reasonable commands of their Creator.

Lamech, the fifth in descent from Cain, was the father of Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal-cain, who are represented by Moses as having been extraordinary proficients in several of the arts, both useful and ornamental. (About A. M. 500.) Jabal "was the father of such as dwell in tents, and of such as have cattle." Or, he was a famous shepherd and tent-maker; and a teacher of others. Abel had been a shepherd long before. Jubal "was the father of all such as handle the harp and organ,"—or all *stringed* and all *wind* instruments; the original terms being generic. Tubal-cain was "an instructer of every artificer in brass and iron;" the first *smith* on record;—a noted manufacturer of warlike instruments and domestic utensils;—an ingenious artist, and a teacher of others. Agricultural implements, at least, must have been in use several centuries before. For Cain was "a tiller of the ground," and Adam a gardener. The former, too, had built a city; and of course, it may be presumed, made use of *iron* in sundry ways. Savages know nothing of iron.

Here, it might not be irrelevant to the general scope of our argument, to glance at several of the circumstances which were peculiarly favorable to the progress of the arts among the Antediluvians.

1. Their great age; and probably greater size and strength. Most of that very small number of individuals whose age is recorded by Moses, lived nearly a thousand

years; and others may have lived much longer, for aught we know to the contrary. What might have been achieved in science and the arts, by genius and perseverance, during a single life protracted through a period of eight or ten centuries, can only be conjectured from the efforts of modern intellect, since life has been limited to three score years and ten. "There were giants in the earth in those days," (Gen. 6: 4,) that is, before the deluge—as there were soon after.

2. They had stronger inducements to the erection of superior, more costly, more durable and more capacious edifices and monuments, public and private, than exist at present. They might reasonably calculate on reaping the benefits of their labors and expenditures.

3. The immense population of the antediluvian world. Sundry very learned and judicious authors suppose that, upon a moderate computation, there were in this world at least two millions of millions of souls. Arts *must* flourish in the midst of such a population. Even the necessaries of mere animal existence could not be procured by such a multitude, in a savage or uncivilized state.

4. One language before the deluge. This peculiar distinction of the antediluvians, probably contributed more than any or all others, to their steady advancement in knowledge and the arts; and certainly to prevent their degeneracy into savages.*

---

* The most direct, efficient and obvious cause of the speedy degeneracy of a large proportion of our race immediately after the general dispersion, was, no doubt, the 'confusion of tongues' which preceded and occasioned that event. This sudden and extraordinary multiplication of languages among the primitive inhabitants of the plains of Shinar, I believe, is not usually assigned as a cause of the *savageism* which ensued. At least, I have not met with it. It deserves a more prominent exhibition and development than it has hitherto obtained I once supposed it so easy a matter to account for the existing diversity in language, that I scarcely deemed a miracle necessary at the outset to effect it. My opinion on this subject is totally changed. Without a miracle, human language would have continued *essentially* one, after the flood, as it had been before; and then the savage state would never have existed—at least in the ordinary course of human events. Language

5. The earth was probably more fertile, and the climate more healthful, and more auspicious to longevity, and consequently to every species of mental and corporeal exertion and enterprise, than at present. We refer to the cosmogonists and archaeologists generally, for an account of the physical changes which the earth is supposed to have undergone in consequence of the deluge; as regards its internal structure—the order, arrangement and mixture of its several strata—the formation of mountains, valleys, oceans, islands, lakes, deserts, marshes—its fertility and salubrity—the position of its axis, whether at first inclined to the plane of the ecliptic as at present; or whether the plane of the equator was coincident with the plane of the ecliptic, so that the sun in its diurnal motion would *seem* to move always in the equator, but henceforth became oblique to the same;—whence an increase of the year from 360 days to its present length; whence also the difference of seasons, and the effects of such a change, etc.

But, to proceed with the argument. Moses is our only authority for every thing appertaining to the antediluvian world. He has rapidly sketched the mere outlines of its history. A few most important facts he has clearly stated. These facts accord with the dictates of enlightened reason and sound philosophy. He has solved the problem of this world's origin; and supplied the elements from which the true character and condition of our wayward race may be ascertained from the beginning. He gives "a local habitation" to the golden age of fiction; and shows us how "death and all our wo" were the consequence and the penalty of man's disobedience to his Maker's righteous mandate.

In dignity, in intellect, in virtue, in happiness, in glory, he

---

in itself, and while uninfluenced by other or foreign dialects, is the most immutable and permanent thing in the world.

Again: should it be assumed that the art of writing, in some form, is indispensable to civilization, and that neither the Antediluvians nor early Postdiluvians possessed the art, and therefore that they must have been barbarians or savages, I answer: It cannot be *proved* that writing was *unknown* at any period anterior to the age of Moses; in whose time, even alphabetical writing, as we now practise it, was as perfect as it has ever been since.

was, at the first, but a *little* lower than the angels. What he would have been, had he remained innocent and dutiful, is not for us to conjecture,—except so far as we know what angels and the spirits of the just made perfect are and ever will be. But though great was his fall from this exalted height, yet he did not sink so low in the moral or intellectual scale, as at once to lose his knowledge or his faculties. Though guilty, condemned, degraded, he was still sustained and cherished and guided by the kindly arm of infinite mercy and wisdom. Though the earth was cursed for his sake, yet he still retained his dominion over it. And although in the course of a few generations, we behold the countless millions of our race rioting in all manner of wickedness, with the exception of a single individual and his family, still we discover no traces or vestiges of savage life upon the earth. Men may lose all knowledge of the true God, all reverence for his character and laws, all relish for his service and worship, while yet they may be highly distinguished in science and the arts. Ancient Egypt, and Greece, and Rome will testify, that the grossest moral darkness and depravity do not always imply, or are not necessarily connected with, a corresponding degradation of the intellectual character,—or that they are at all inconsistent with the highest state of civilization and refinement.

During the first historical period then of 1656 years [Hebrew chronology]—that is, from the creation to the deluge—all mankind, or at least the generations from which Noah descended, were civilized.

Of the state of the arts in Noah's time, we may form some conjecture from the ark which he constructed [by the divine command indeed, but without any extraordinary aid or direction, so far as we know] for the purpose of preserving himself and family, with as many of the different species of beasts, birds and reptiles, as were necessary to replenish the *new* world with inhabitants, after the destruction of the *old*. This was probably the most astonishing structure, on several accounts, that ever rested upon the earth, or floated upon the surface of the mighty deep. A ship of at least one hundred thousand tons burthen! What a specimen of architectural skill, was not this last memento of antediluvian art? Noah was its builder—its architect;—he directed and superintended the work. Thousands of artisans, mechanics and

laborers were, no doubt, employed on it, who perished beneath the waves which bore it from their reach and from their view for ever.

When Noah entered the ark, he was 600 years old. Japheth, 100—Shem, 98—and Ham, probably 96. They therefore had time and opportunity sufficient to become intimately acquainted with all the arts and learning which the antediluvians possessed. And we may reasonably conclude that they diligently and successfully improved the time and the means which they enjoyed. They knew that they were to be the depositaries of all the knowledge and attainments of past ages; and to become the instructers of future generations. They were familiar with the cities, edifices, and other productions of the art, genius, and industry of the old world. The ark itself was many years in building before their eyes. They lived together a year within its capacious bosom—where they had the finest opportunity possible for the study of zoology; and, next to Adam, they were probably better versed in that department of natural science than any other mortals have ever been.

How much of the abstract sciences, and how much of literature they may have derived from their ancestors and brethren, it is impossible for us to determine. If we say they had nothing, be it so. It is, however, after all, a mere *gratis dictum*. The fact can never be proved. Astronomy is conceded by many, from a variety of circumstances, to have been considerably known before the deluge. But it is the fashion to deny every thing to antiquity, in favor of which we have no direct positive evidence. Conjecture or analogy is not allowed to supply the absence or defect of explicit testimony or substantial proof in any case.

It would be too mortifying to the pride of modern science to suppose it, for a single moment, to have been within the range of possibility, that the ancients should have made the sublime discoveries and demonstrations of a Newton or La Place. Granted that they did not. We shall probably, however, in the course of our investigations, find some things to balance the account. Facts are stubborn things. Fortunately for the fair fame of ancient genius, there are living witnesses yet speaking, and speaking loudly, in the midst of surrounding desolation and barbarism, the praises of an age to which even Grecian history does not reach.

But let us return to the mountains of Armenia, and see the little remnant of the human family issuing from the ark, and commencing a new career in a world in which probably not a vestige remained to awaken melancholy recollections or tender associations—not a relic of that grandeur and magnificence on which they had formerly gazed with admiration, or contemplated with sentiments of unutterable compassion in the view of that awful catastrophe which they foresaw would speedily overwhelm their vain and guilty possessors.

How long the ark itself continued as a monument of art, or a memorial of divine vengeance and of divine mercy—or as a model of great design and exquisite skill in architecture, whether for ship-building and naval enterprise, or for temples, towers, public or private edifices—Moses has not told us, and tradition is not worth regarding.

Noah, we are informed, became a husbandman. He began the world (to use a common phrase) as Adam and his sons had done before him, by cultivating the earth. Here then is no approach to savage life.

Noah and his family, for some time probably, cultivated the valleys in the neighborhood of Ararat, one of the mountains of Armenia, on which the ark settled after the subsidence of the waters. As they increased in numbers, they appear to have passed along the banks of the Euphrates, which rises in the mountains of Armenia, (Vid. *Herodotus,*) till at length they came to the plains of Shinar or Babylonia, —allowed to be the most fertile country in the East. Here they built a city and commenced a tower, whose top might "reach unto heaven," i. e. to the visible heavenly luminaries or to the clouds. For this purpose they burnt brick, which they used instead of stone; "and slime," or bitumen [*Lat. Vulg.*] or ἀσφαλτὸς, [*Græc. Sept.*] "had they for mortar." (Gen. 11: 3, 4) Three years, it is said, they prepared their materials, and 22 years carried on their building. Their arrogant and rebellious attempt displeased the Lord, who miraculously confounded their language, which put an effectual stop to the work, procured for it the name of Babel or "confusion," and obliged the people to disperse themselves, and replenish the world.

It is thought by some that the family of Shem did not concur in this presumptuous enterprise,—that Nimrod, the son of Cush and grandson of Ham, was the principal leader:

but of this we have no certain evidence. What became of this mighty tower (commenced about 100 years after the deluge) we cannot determine. Nearly 1800 years after its erection, Herodotus saw a structure at Babylon (the temple of Jupiter Belus) consisting of eight towers, raised one above another, built of bricks and bitumen, of immense size. This lofty edifice is believed by many to have been the identical tower described by Moses. Bel or Belus was a title given to Nimrod, according to Bryant. Its ruins, or the supposed ruins of this ancient tower or temple, have been frequently noticed by antiquaries and modern travellers.*

It is not material to our present purpose to inquire into the object or end for which this remarkable tower was built. Some suppose it was designed to be a "temple to the host of heaven," or for idolatrous worship of some kind;—others, that it was intended to afford an asylum to the builders and their families in case of another deluge; like the Pyramids of Egypt, perhaps;—others again, that it was designed to be the central ornament or principal fortress of a grand metropolitan city, the seat of government, in order to prevent a general dispersion of the people. "Let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth." Gen. 11: 4.

The sons of Noah had witnessed the massive and colossal structures of the old world—they had seen the great ship which had preserved them from a watery grave—ambition or vanity, or a distrust of the divine providence and promise, might have prompted them, at least some of them, [say the family of Ham, known to have been profane and disobedient,] to imitate the proud monuments of art which had adorned the antediluvian world, that future generations might possess a specimen and a model of the same stupen-

---

* Vide Herodotus, St. Jerome, Calmet, Bochart, Rollin, Bryant, Rich, Niebuhr, Rennell, Della Valle, Ker Porter, Grotefend, etc.

It is very questionable, however, whether even the site of old Babylon can be ascertained at the present day. Lucian intimates that not a vestige of Nineveh remained in his time; and he *predicts* that such also would soon be the fate of Babylon. In this particular, at least, he accords with the Hebrew prophets.

dous and magnificent architecture—or that their own name might be immortalized by their labors—or that it might serve as a citadel or military castle of defence and protection—or as a palace or residence for their chief, [Ham, for instance, or Nimrod,] for many centuries to come; not realizing that their life was to be shortened—or—but it is no matter what they had in view.

It proves that they were still equal to great undertakings; that they had not lost that knowledge of the arts which they must have brought with them from the ruins and the wreck of former nations. They were still a civilized people.

Down to this period assuredly, if there be truth in Scripture, no trace of savageness can be found in our world. We fearlessly and most confidently oppose facts to theory. And we are willing cheerfully to submit the case to any honest, enlightened, independent jury of our peers.

Civilization and the arts continued to flourish in the countries first occupied after the flood. In the fruitful plains of Shinar or Babylon—upon the eastern and southern shores of the Mediterranean—along the banks of the Euphrates, the Tigris and the Nile—and in the adjacent regions.

But here commences a new era. Mankind were now to be dispersed and scattered over the face of the earth.

As men travelled further from their original residence—into colder, more sterile, more inhospitable, or more unhealthful climes—into rocky, mountainous regions—remote islands—impervious forests and deserts, by this time, filled with beasts of prey and venomous reptiles—especially when the colonies were small and indifferently furnished with artisans and mechanics, or with the implements and utensils indispensable to agriculture and carpentry—in such circumstances, it is easy to account for the speedy degeneracy of numerous tribes, and for their lapse into a barbarous and savage state.

Thus, Northern Asia, the greater part of Africa, the islands of the Mediterranean Sea and of the ocean, Europe and America, appear to have been inhabited by rude and savage and migratory hordes, as far back as history and tradition extend; while the same history and tradition—together with Scripture—assure us that Chaldea, Assyria,

Phœnicia and Egypt,—perhaps, India and other eastern countries,—were civilized and polished from the remotest times, or from the beginning. And these have proved the fountain of civilization, letters and the arts, to every other part of the globe, where they have been found, or where they now exist.

From the building of Babel to the period at which Egypt appears, on the page of authentic history, a great and flourishing empire, famed alike for wealth and power and wisdom and science, the interval is short; the steps are few and easily marked.

We have thus presented the outlines of our general views on this curious subject, under the heads of Reason and Scripture.

The *third* branch of the argument, namely, that from History, will be illustrated in a future article; in which, we shall endeavor to ascend the historical stream of civilization, till we fairly land upon the classic shores of ancient Greece;—whence, confessedly, modern Europe and European America have derived all their civility, literature and arts. Nor shall we assign the palm of originating these to the ingenious Greeks; much as we admire them, and unquestionable as are their claims to the everlasting gratitude of mankind. We shall pursue our voyage to Egypt and the East;—where will be found all the luxury, beauty, opulence, splendor and refinement which usually distinguish the meridian of national greatness, or which characterize its decline—even at the earliest epoch to which Grecian history and tradition ever ventured to approach. Here was civilization of the highest order, when the Greeks themselves were, by their own showing, fierce and untamed barbarians.

Thus, commencing from the creation of man, we learn from Scripture that he existed in a civilized state, at least down to the period of the general dispersion: and, reversing the order of our inquiry, we shall find from *history* that civilization is still traceable up to the age and the region, *when* and *where* this memorable event is believed to have occurred.

ARTICLE III.

The Life and Character of John the Evangelist.

By Edward E. Salisbury, New Haven, Conn.

From the earliest ages of the Christian Church, there has been a charm in the name of "the beloved disciple;" and an air of mystery has been thrown around the endearing relation, which subsisted between him and his Divine Redeemer. But, if we mistake not, the tender, yearning affection, with which he clung to his Saviour, has been so exclusively dwelt upon as to produce a one-sided view of his character. It is our design to present some scattered memorials of his life, and to attempt a delineation of his character as "the beloved disciple."

A son of Zebedee and Salome, and born, as is supposed, either in Bethsaida or Capernaum, he appears to have passed his earlier days as a fisherman on the sea of Tiberias. (Matth. 4: 18—21 and 27: 56, comp. with Mark 15: 40 and 16: 1.) Several things lead to the supposition, that his parents were above the lower class of Jews in respect to worldly circumstances. For instance, his father was assisted by kind servants on his fishing excursions, (Mark 1: 20,) and his mother joined herself, probably on the death of her husband, to that company of women which attended our Saviour to minister to his daily necessities. (Matth. 27: 55, 56.) She was one of those who provided spices to embalm his body, (Luke 23: 55, 56,) and John himself is said to have taken to his own house (*εἰς τὰ ἴδια*) the mother of our Lord, after she had been so tenderly committed to his care.

What religious impressions John may have received in the spring-time of life, while instructed, according to the custom of the Jews, by his parents, in the Law and the Prophets, we have no certain knowledge. But from the devotion of his mother to the service of Christ in his journeyings from place to place, we may infer that she had been a zealous expectant of the promised Messiah, and had entertained

truer views of his character and offices than were prevalent in the nation at large. Still there is reason to believe, that she was not entirely uninfluenced by common Jewish prejudice, as appears from her asking Christ to bestow on her sons the two highest places in his kingdom. It is therefore to be supposed that the unbosoming of maternal feeling may have led the mind of John, even in childhood, to imaginations of the anticipated scenes of the "kingdom of God." That occupation, too, in which he was engaged, so conducive to reflection, as has been pleasingly observed by Tholuck, may have contributed to deepen impressions which filial regard alone might have secured from being lost. Besides, the first impulses of childhood in John were never subjected to the restraining influence of Rabbinical instruction. (Acts 4: 13.)

In the gospel history, John first appears as a disciple of the Messiah's forerunner; and it seems most likely, that he was a follower of the Baptist from the commencement of this reformer's annunciations concerning the approach of "the kingdom of Heaven." During this period, the visions which may have been awakened in his youthful fancy, through the suggestions of ancient prophecy, must have become more fixed, though somewhat chastened, doubtless, by the rigid tone of his teacher. In such a state of mind, waiting for the hope of Israel, how welcome must have been the sight of the dove alighting on the head of the baptized Nazarene; while a heavenly voice proclaimed him to be the well-beloved Son of God. But Jesus did not then begin his public ministry; from the gaze of an expecting people he retired into the wilderness, to meet and to subdue the chief adversary of his mission. To all who recognised him as their long-looked for Anointed, this must have been an interval of painful suspense. At length, however, as the Baptist and two of his disciples were standing together, Jesus drew near. A mere hint is sufficient to recall him to their remembrance. The disciples overhear their teacher's devout exclamation: "Lo, the lamb of God!"—and, immediately leaving him, they follow Jesus. Nor are they willing to be again separated from him, till they have found out the place of his abode, and remained with him for several hours. In this incident is contained the germ of that fond attachment between our Saviour and his disciple John, which ex-

panded with ever increasing vigor and beauty on earth, and is now perfected by the purity, and ennobled by the higher associations of the heavenly world. In the next scene in which John appears, Jesus meets him on the shores of Tiberias, and calls him to be his constant follower. For some reason unknown, after making himself acquainted with his adored Messiah, he had returned to his former employment; but his affections were fastened on another object than home, and so we see him readily forsaking every thing to follow Christ.

From this period to the termination of the Saviour's ministry, all that is known of him is embraced in a few scattered incidents. With Peter and James he was present at the restoration of Jairus's daughter. In company with the same disciples we find him a witness of the Redeemer's transfiguration. At the last supper, when Christ was bidding farewell to his followers, John reclined next to him, and was looked upon by the others as his bosom-friend. (John 13: 23, 24.) It was John's sad privilege, as one of the chosen three, to behold the agony of Gethsemane, and hear that touching expression, "My soul is exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death." While the trial of Jesus was going on in the hall of Pilate, we see the beloved disciple fearlessly entering, and afterwards leading in Peter, who had been timidly loitering at the door. (John 18: 15, etc.) And how soothing, in the last dark hour of the crucifixion,—like the mild beaming of the evening-star on the edge of a retiring thunder-cloud—is that parting interchange of affection, as the weeping eye of "the beloved disciple" meets the agonized yet tender look of the dying Saviour, and that simple charge is given, "Behold thy mother!" When the women, who had been visiting the sepulchre of the Lord, reported that the stone was rolled away, it appears that Peter and John ran thither in company, eager to become convinced of what seems to have been beyond the expectations of either, that their Lord had risen. After the Saviour's resurrection John went into Galilee, and there, meeting Jesus according to appointment, he followed him to receive his final instructions and promises. But soon the day of separation came; and Jesus ascended in a cloud to heaven, leaving the amazed and sorrowing disciples to assemble alone at Jerusalem.

The labors of the Apostle John, in fulfilling his Master's last commission, are but slightly alluded to in the Scripture narrative. That they were important and widely extended, however, his writings and tradition leave no room to doubt. We first find him in the temple, with Peter, healing a lame man; (Acts 3: 1—7;) then on a mission from the primitive church to confirm some recent converts among the Samaritans. (Acts 8: 14, etc.) Of his course of life during several years following his return, no traces have been discovered. It seems most likely that he was teaching and exercising the apostolic gifts in various parts of Judea, revisiting at intervals the head church in the capital city. When Paul went up, the first time after his conversion, to Jerusalem, John was not there: (Gal. 1:19:) when Paul and Barnabas, fourteen years later, made their journey to that city, to seek counsel in regard to enforcing the observance of Jewish rites on heathen converts, John was there, and took part with Peter and James in commending their associates to new labors among the heathen. (Gal. 2: 1—9. Acts 15: 1, etc.) But he must have soon gone from Jerusalem; for at the time of Paul's last visit and imprisonment there, it is evident that John was absent. (Acts 21.) We are able to trace him no further by the aid of the Scriptures.

But credible accounts of some future events of his life have been collected from early writings. Antiquity is unanimous in testifying, that his later years were spent in Ephesus, and the neighboring parts of Asia Minor. The precise period of the commencement of his residence there must be left in uncertainty; the most probable opinion is, that his labors in that country began at the death of Paul. In the letter written by this apostle, only two years before his martyrdom, to Timothy, who was then at Ephesus, no mention is made of John; who must have been referred to in some way, had his ministrations been already extended to that field. Paul would have presented the relations of Timothy to the church there in a very different light had that young disciple been associated with the apostle John. It may be mentioned, also, that just at the period of Paul's death, the last Jewish war was breaking out, which ended in the destruction of Jerusalem; so that there seems to have been an occasion, in the political event then occurring, for

John's final departure from Judea. In Asia Minor John was met by persecution. For preaching the word of God and testifying of Jesus, he was banished to the island of Patmos; where he was favored with those visions of the future glory of the Christian Church, which are recorded in the Apocalypse. Returning from this banishment he resumed his labors; fired, doubtless, by the bright visions just opened to him, to greater diligence and self-denial.

A most beautiful and expressive picture of the labors of this apostle is afforded in an anecdote, which, if not true in all its particulars, appears sufficiently characteristic to have arisen from some actual occurrence. It is thus related: "John having returned from his exile in Patmos, was called to the neighboring communities to institute churches, and to ordain bishops and elders. On this apostolic ordination-journey, in a certain city—according to some, Smyrna—he met in the assembly of the Christians, a youth whose person and mind were alike remarkable. This youth he recommended, on his departure, to the particular oversight and instruction of the bishop. At first the bishop instructed him with great care; but after baptizing him, he ceased to watch him as strictly as before. The young man was soon led astray, and became more and more estranged from the Christian life, and at length the head of a band of robbers, and even the bloodiest and most cruel of them all. When John revisited the church and heard of the ruined youth, in bitter anguish he went immediately in search of the lost one. Notwithstanding his extreme age, he shunned no trouble or danger. He carried off from the robber-band their youthful leader, and, by pathetic discourse of love, brought him at last to return to the Christian church in sincere penitence and reformation." The circumstances of John's closing days are imaged forth by one of the early fathers, who relates, that, when so old that he was obliged to be carried to the Christian assemblies in the arms of his disciples, and was unable to speak continuedly, he said only these words: "little children, love one another;" and when the Christians, weary of always hearing the same thing, asked him why he said nothing else, he replied, "because it is the command of the Lord, and if this alone is done, it is enough."

Aided by this faint and broken outline of the life of John, we will now endeavor to delineate the principal features of

the character of this apostle, viewed as "the beloved disciple." Under this particular aspect, it is obvious, we are not to consider him merely as exhibiting the Christian life; for as our Saviour could not but love his own image equally in all, this cannot have been the object of his special affection. Nor is our attention to be confined to the native, constitutional peculiarities of John; these, in themselves considered, so far from presenting any ground for the Saviour's fond attachment, seem to have been adapted, rather, to awaken cautious reserve in his own bosom. But combining both these views of the subject, we are to consider some peculiarities of John, with reference to their influence on the form of his manifestation of the Christian life.

One characteristic of "the beloved disciple," distinguishing him from the other followers of Christ, was *a delicate susceptibility of impression.* It is true that the new birth gives to every soul an unwonted quickness of sensibility. This wonderful operation of the divine Spirit, however, consists only in the removal of moral obduracy; it never alters the constitution of the soul. It clears the soul's vision indeed, so that the objects of religious faith are no longer dimly seen through the darkening and distorting medium of sinful impurities. But freed from these, the spiritual eye itself may be fitted, in its own individual conformation, to reflect more or less perfectly the objects presented to it. It may take an image of the minutest point, the most delicate shadings and contrasts of divine truth, or merely a bold outline. John seems to have been one whose soul, responsive by nature to the slightest impressions, had a peculiarly delicate sensitiveness to the disclosures which were ever multiplying upon him in the progress of his Christian life. That he was natively sensitive to a high degree, is apparent from certain incidents occurring in his history before the Spirit of God had thoroughly penetrated and chastened his feelings. Once when our Saviour was approaching a Samaritan village, on his way to Jerusalem, the inhabitants, moved by their national antipathy, refused to admit him into the place. (Luke 9: 52—56.) This, to the sensitive soul of John, was like a sudden gust ruffling the sea: "Wilt thou"—he appeals to Jesus, as if fully expecting consent—"Wilt thou that we call down fire from heaven to consume them, as Elias did?" The occurrence might indeed have been anticipated from

the well-known, hereditary alienation between the Jews and the Samaritans; and none of our Lord's disciples, except James, seem to have sympathized with John in his quick sense of the insult. But his soul was instantly in commotion; and thrilled by the first excitement, he appears to have been incapable, for the time, of that mingled feeling which the circumstances of the case might have been expected to awaken. Indeed it is most consistent to suppose, that if the words of Jesus, "ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of!" did at length hush the tremor of the young disciple's indignation, it was not that he felt less keenly, but only because his sensibilities were seized with a higher passion—shame at being reproved by his Master. The same native susceptibility was shown by him on another occasion, when he came and told our Saviour that he had rebuked a man for casting out devils who was not a professed follower of Christ. This seeming compromise of conscience with the opinion of men, John felt so sensibly, that he could not sympathize with any qualifying considerations. He yielded himself wholly to the first impression, unaffected by the thought, that possibly, this conduct might mark a degree of faith, rather than a compromise between conviction and the fear of man.

The Christian character of John, when more decided and matured, showed itself strongly colored by the same constitutional peculiarity. Had this native quality been left to itself, unchecked by parental influence, and unchastened by the grace of God, that John, whose soul, pouring itself forth in inspired writings, one delights to observe—so yielding to the slightest touch of heavenly truth—would have been known, if at all, only as the dissolute prey of contending passions. His susceptibility would have been like the perturbations of angry waters, which surrender themselves to every coming gust. But in the confirmed Christian and apostle, this trait of character appears like the rapid and transparent picturing of fast succeeding beauties and glories of the opening heavens on the bosom of some stream, charmed by the presence of an unseen, presiding spirit. If this responsive picturing in his soul was sometimes overcast with a shade from untimely objects, such a disfiguring shadow was but transient. Who, possessing any sensibility himself, can fail to discover that peculiar pathos, which im-

bues the narratives of the gospel of John, and so distinguishes them from the form in which the same incidents are related by the other evangelists? Who has not perceived how he lingers on the particulars of each occurrence,—presenting it with full impressiveness as an object of feeling, and for this reason, offending the cold reader by seemingly useless amplification? It is evident that he wrote from a heart full of emotion, as otherwise his gospel would not be so exclusively the delight of sensitive minds. Who has not observed, also, the unfeigned simplicity of his narratives,—how lightly he touches on each particular, showing that, far from forcing himself to emotion, he felt within him an instantaneous quickness of response to whatever was affecting in the scenes which he described? At some incidents he seems only to glance;—for his heart was full on the mere mention of them. In John's Epistles, too, there are many striking manifestations of native sensibility in Christian sentiment. No attentive reader can have failed to notice that peculiar style of association, in which this apostle announces the truths of the gospel. Paul unfolds these truths in their logical connections and mutual dependence; John utters them in their naked simplicity, as not to be disputed. To him they seemed too transparent to need the outward polish of argument. In some of his statements there is obscurity, to minds differently constituted from his own, on account of his not expressing in words his whole meaning. His quickness and fulness of sensibility must have led him to consider this as superfluous, and indeed impossible. This peculiarly delicate sensibility of John to the scenes in which his Messiah moved, and to the words of life which fell from those divine lips, could not but attach him most closely to the person of Jesus. And when his Redeemer had withdrawn his personal presence, that "witness of the Spirit," doubtless, testified to his being still "the beloved disciple," as each gracious communication from his unseen Lord touched his soul with emotions which answered to all the nicer shadings of truth.

Another peculiarity of John's Christian character was *ardency of temperament.* He did not receive impressions with quiet passiveness; but he had an impetuosity of mind which rendered it impossible to touch his sensibility, without also rousing his activity. It was probably the recognition

of this characteristic, very generally overlooked in modern times, which gave to this apostle, in an early age of the church, the traditionary symbol of an eagle. That he must have been of an ardent temper might be inferred simply from his being "the beloved disciple;" for it would seem to be necessarily involved in that due regard to one's own character which must be supposed in every particular attachment. Did Jesus silently luxuriate in the heaven-born emotions of his soul? Did he weep only inwardly over the sins and miseries of the world? Did he not rather show himself intent to declare the full sense which he had of human guilt, and his own infinite compassion, and to figure forth to every eye his divine soul, in earnest rebukes, pressing expostulations, and entreating invitations? How unlikely then, that the selected object of his warmest affection, among those who were to follow in his steps as messengers of salvation, should be a man possessing a mere tame sensitiveness, without any energy of passion! Indeed, it is altogether incredible, that our Lord's "beloved disciple" should be of that melting quality of mind, which is commonly ascribed to him.

But there is abundant direct proof that John was no less ardent than sensitive; that his passion was not that of a merely pensive spirit, but was marked by the flashings which belong only to enthusiasm. This is plainly intimated in the appellation, "son of thunder," given by our Lord to him, in common with Peter and James. Besides, had "the beloved disciple" been a man of tender feeling alone, how differently would he have appeared on the occasion already referred to, when the Samaritans refused to receive his Master to their village! He would have been struck dumb, instead of breaking out with bold denunciations against the inhabitants. Mere tenderness of feeling shows itself in the half-uttered sob, or starting tear; it is never loud and boisterous. John's native impetuosity seems to have shown itself in his earliest days, under the form of fractious self-will; but as his soul grew in the Christian life, its ardor became directed with concentrated force towards one grand, absorbing object, out of and above himself. It assumed a more equable character, but was on that account none the less real. We see him following the exasperated multitude of his Lord's accusers into the hall of Pilate, and standing

there a witness of their impious scoffings: he places himself at the foot of the cross, in full view of the mortal agonies of the object of his tenderest affection, there to brave the jeers of indifferent or malicious spectators; and at the rumor of the rifling of the sepulchre, he hastens thither, and even outruns Peter who was his companion. Surely, nothing but the devotion of an ardent mind could have led him to such scenes, or sustained him under their harrowing impression.

But John's epistolary writings have been supposed to indicate a character quite irreconcilable with an impetuous temper. Those terms of fond endearment, however, which John so delights to multiply, may be regarded as well the suitable expressions of a vehement affection, as the effusions of mere tenderness. That John's affectionateness was not of the kind which descends and rests upon its objects like gentle dew, but rather like a shower from a suddenly broken cloud, every one must be convinced by certain phraseology in each of his Epistles, which could have been adopted only on the impulse of a mind impetuous, strenuous, and fervid in all its emotions. How, otherwise, can such vehement language as the following be explained? "He who saith, I know Christ, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him:" "If any man come to you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither say to him, God-speed:" "Who is a liar, if not he who denies that Jesus is the Christ?" "Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence, receiveth us not. Therefore, when I come, I will remember his doings, prating against us with malicious words." These are not the natural expressions of a quiet, passive sensibility; the soul of the apostle seems not to be melting at the thought of these offences against Christian truth and morality. His language is rather the precipitate outbreaking of a soul, ardent, as well as sensitive,—no sooner touched than kindled into a glow. But who can doubt the active ardor of that mind, which, while it traced the varied scenes of the apocalypse,—all so overpoweringly strange, solemn, and majestic,—and received their full impression, was capable of rising upon its own emotions, and bursting forth in those descriptions of surpassing vigor, which close the message of Revelation like oft echoing peals of retiring thunder?

The only other characteristic of "the beloved disciple"

which we shall notice, is *a propensity of mind to profound views of things*;—to the consideration of known realities, with reference rather to the fundamental truths involved in them, than to their appearances. The writings of John give full evidence of his having penetrated deeply into the ground-work of the Christian scheme. He manifestly strove to attain a glimpse of divine things in their primitive reality, to view them, not in their *mode* and *manner*, as topics of logical discrimination, addressing themselves to the understanding, but in their *essence*, as recognisable by enlightened and sanctified reason. It may be said, indeed, that John's surpassing the ordinary apostolic conception of divine truth is to be accounted for, simply by supposing the Spirit of inspiration to have favored him with a supernatural comprehensiveness of mind beyond his fellow-apostles. Still the reason of his being thus aided, it is natural to suppose, must have existed in his own mental constitution. To Isaiah there appears to have been granted far sublimer visions of the future glory of the church, than to any other prophet; while, at the same time, the characteristic propriety of the divine method leads us to regard the prophet's utterance of these visions, as an expression of his own native sublimity of soul. So it may be said of John, that if the Spirit of inspiration assisted him to take deeper views of the gospel, these must be considered as at once tokens of special divine favor, and manifestations of constitutional profoundness of mind.

As an indication of such deeper views, the general style of his expressions concerning the person of the Messiah deserves notice. It is well depicted in these words of an ancient father: "The other three evangelists walked with the Lord as with a man, on earth, and said but little of his divinity; but John, as if it were irksome to remain on earth, thunders in the very beginning of his gospel;—rises not only above the earth, and above the whole circuit of the atmosphere and heavens, but even above all the hosts of angels,—the whole order of the invisible powers,—and makes his way directly to Him by whom all things are done, saying: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He existed in the beginning with God, and all things were made by Him." His representations of the nature of Christ's work as a Redeemer,

prove him to have viewed it subjectively,—in its profound, original adaptation to the disorder, darkness, and benumbed sensibility prevailing in the human soul, rather than to the form which it assumed in reference to the moral government of God. It is described as "regeneration," "light," "eternal life;" rather than, as by Paul, under the terms "grace," "justification," "redemption." John's conception, too, of the state of the renewed soul goes far beyond Paul's "reconciliation to God," and his "near access to God." It is "dwelling in love," "fellowship with the Father, and with his Son, Jesus Christ," "dwelling in Christ."

It appears, then, that sensibility, ardor, and depth of mind were prominent characteristics of "the beloved disciple;" and it was most natural, that Jesus, as a divine Teacher, should love him with a peculiar affection. But to Christ, as the originator of spiritual life, there must have been a ground for this preference of the individual peculiarity of John's Christian character, in its special accordance with the essential nature of regeneration. And this suggests an important reflection. If susceptibility, ardor, and depth of mind constitute a medium most favorable to the development of the Christian life, this life must have an alliance in its nature, with those constitutional qualities. It must then be true that sensitiveness, a glowing ardor, and a penetrating perception of mind in respect to divine things, are essential elements of that state which is called "being begotten of God."

ARTICLE IV.

The Ancient Commerce of Western Asia.

By the Rev. Albert Barnes, Philadelphia, Pa.

Under the general term, Western Asia, I include Palestine and the adjacent regions of ancient Chaldea, Syria and Arabia; not designing to offer any remarks on what would be itself sufficient for an interesting article—Asia Minor.

There are few persons in the Christian world who do not feel *some* interest in Palestine, and the adjacent regions. It

is not indeed a country rich in classic associations; and the feelings with which it is to be trod by the traveller must be different from those which he has who wanders among the ruins of Ionia, or who walks over the plain of Marathon, or who roams over the desolate fields of ancient Troy, or who climbs the side of Parnassus, or who looks upon the Parthenon, and the gently flowing Ilissus. Yet it has not been without some interesting associations apart from the subject of religion. The reader of ancient history will remember that it was on this land that Alexander of Macedon poured his phalanxes when on his way to the conquests of the East; that it was here that Tyre resisted his arms for eight months before it could be subdued; and that it was here that his chief battles were fought, and his glory achieved. The great kingdoms of Assyria and Babylonia also, in their times—not less extended than in subsequent ages was the empire of Rome itself—existed in this portion of the world. Science too, if it had not its origin, yet received some of its earliest attentions in Chaldea, on whose plains, perhaps, men first looked out with attention on the stars, and gave names to Orion, to Arcturus, and to the Pleiades. In that region too, in later times, stood the empire of the Caliphs, in whose capital science received some of its mightiest impulses, and in which the elements of science were originated, which, brought back by the crusades, exert their wide influence still on mankind.

Were it my purpose, I could easily occupy the space for this article in descriptions of battles and sieges; of the conquests, the flames, and the horrors of war; of scenes of ambition and splendor and blood, enacted on the now desolate region which I propose to describe, of as thrilling interest as have occurred on more classic ground. I refer to one single place. On the south of Mount Tabor, in Palestine, there spreads out for some twenty miles in extent, the beautiful plain of Esdraelon—the great battle ground of the oriental world. It is described as a plain of great beauty; and hither, from different nations, armies have rushed to meet in mortal conflict. Waterloo is celebrated for one great battle; and Leuctra for another;—but many an army from distant climes, with different arms, and complexions, and objects, has been gathered on the plain of Esdraelon. and the bones of warriors, of different ages and nations, have

found their last resting place there. Barak, descending with ten thousand men from Mount Tabor, here discomfited the army of Sisera; and here Josiah, king of Judah, met the king of Egypt, and fell. "It has been a chosen place of encampment in every contest carried on in this country from the early days of the Assyrian history, until the disastrous march of Napoleon from Egypt into Syria. Jews, Gentiles, Saracens, Christian Crusaders, and Anti-Christian Frenchmen, Egyptians, Persians, Druses, Turks, and Arabs, warriors out of every nation which is under heaven, have pitched their tents upon the plain of Esdraelon, and have beheld the various banners of their nations wet with the dews of Tabor and of Hermon."*

To the Christian I need not say that no part of that land can be trod but with thrilling interest. There is not a hill or vale there; a mountain or a plain; a rivulet or a lake; a cliff or a cavern, which is not rendered sacred by some deeply interesting association. It is the land of the prophets and of the Redeemer—the radiating point of what is yet to be the religion of the world. On that land, too, the nations of Europe, roused by the preaching of Peter the Hermit, were poured for conquest;—and there occurred the thrilling and romantic scenes of the crusades—events so momentous in their reflex influence on Europe, and on the civil laws and the literature of the world. Any one of the points on which I have now touched would furnish materials for an interesting article. But I shall not return to them again.

The leading design of this article is, to show that the Scripture prophecies *must* certainly be accomplished; and that there are causes now rendering their fulfilment certain; causes resulting from changes in the commerce of the world which none but an inspired mind could have foreseen. To illustrate this, I shall show the nature and the extent of the ancient commerce of Western Asia; the influence which that commerce had in giving origin to the cities and towns that are now sunk in ruins; the changes which have occurred in the commercial relations of that portion of the world; the causes, and the inevitable effect of those changes in securing the permanent fulfilment of the prophecies. One reason of

* Robinson's Calmet.

entering into this discussion is, that while the fact of the fulfilment of the prophecies respecting Babylon, and Petra, and Tyre is now generally admitted, and is indeed undeniable, the *causes* of their exact fulfilment seem not to be as generally understood, and the reasons which operate to secure the permanent fulfilment of those prophecies seem scarcely to have received any attention. After all that *has* occurred, an infidel might still be disposed to ask, What evidence is there that Babylon and Tyre will not rise from their ruins, and again be at the head of empire and of commerce? Why may not the deserts of Idumea again be thronged with caravans, and Petra be again a splendid commercial emporium? My aim will be to show that the great changes which have occurred in the world make it certain that this can never again occur; that their desolation is complete and certain; and that whatever revolutions may occur again in Western Asia, *those* places are destined to remain as the prophets said they would.

Whoever will cast his eye on the map of the world, will see, that the region of which Babylon was the centre, is by nature perhaps better fitted to be the seat of empire than any other portion of the earth; or at least that it possesses extraordinary advantages for being the centre of a wide dominion. It is a central position between Europe and Western Asia, on the one hand, and Central Asia and India on the other. Whatever may be said of it now, it was once distinguished for a most fertile soil, and for all that can contribute to the wealth and power of a kingdom. It was in fact the early seat of empire. The kingdoms of Assyria and Babylon rose to the height of power long before Rome had extended its arms beyond Italy; and such was the pride, and power, and extent of those kingdoms, that when Alexander had conquered them, and had reached the Indus, he felt that there was a natural limit to conquest, and that he had in fact subdued the world. Amidst all the desolations of war in that vast region, cities struggled into being; and when one fell another rose in its place;—as if the land was reluctant to yield to the desolating tread of conquerors, and would assert its native right to be the centre of power, notwithstanding every effort to strew it with ruins. When, after the downfall of the Chaldean and Persian monarchies, the glory of Babylon waned, Seleucia, a great and flourish-

ing city, rose on the banks of the Tigris. Under the sway of the Arabians, Bagdad and Ormus rivalled Babylon and Seleucia, and became like them the home of the merchant, and the abode of the learned.*

As this region was the natural seat of empire, so it was of ancient commerce. The great prize in all ancient commerce, as it has been to a great extent in all modern commerce, was India. To secure the rich and much valued productions of India led to most of the schemes of commerce in ancient times; to most of the discoveries made by navigation; and to most of the changes which have occurred in the commercial world. This was the object of the ancient commerce by caravans across the plains of Chaldea and Syria; and to accommodate those caravans the cities of Seleucia, and Bagdad, and Tadmor, and Damascus, and Tyre, rose and flourished; and this rich commerce gave existence and splendor to the city of Alexandria in Egypt, more than 1800 years. To accommodate this commerce, Petra rose into grandeur and wealth in Idumea, and Tyre acquired her importance. In subsequent times Venice and Genoa flourished on the riches of the commerce of India; and in pursuit of the same object Columbus directed his course to the west, and discovered the new world; and at nearly the same time the discovery of the Cape of Good Hope gave a new direction to commerce, and changed the aspect of nations. The glittering prize of India, then, has contributed more to the founding of cities and kingdoms, and to the discoveries in the art of navigation, than any other single cause. Nearly all the cities in that region whose commerce I am attempting to describe rose and fell with the fluctuations of that commerce; and the great changes there have been caused by the different direction which the wealth of India has taken in its passage to Europe, and to our own country.—What was that prize? In what did it consist? And why should the changes in it be attended with so important consequences on the aspect of the world?

As all that I have to say depends on the character and value of the ancient commerce of India, and its changes, it is important to remark that the ancient merchandise of India consisted chiefly in that which went rather to promote the

* Bib. Reposit. VII. 365.

luxury, than the necessities or the comforts of mankind. It will at once be seen that the heavier articles of modern commerce could have had no place in the traffic which was carried on, almost wholly by land, with that remote country. Men usually prize that most which comes from distant lands; and though much that was brought from the East was comparatively valueless in regard to the real necessities of life, and contributed much, by the luxury which it engendered and fostered, to the ultimate downfall of the Roman empire, yet it was not sought with the less avidity, and gave birth, as it does now, to some of the most daring and hazardous expeditions in which man can engage. Among the articles which constituted that commerce, and gave so much importance to the ancient intercourse with the oriental world, were,

First—Spices and Aromatics. They were produced chiefly in the East; they were consumed in the West. The custom prevailed in all ancient worship of using frankincense as an agreeable, and, as it was supposed, an acceptable part of worship. It was burnt on the altar and in the censer, in the worship of Jehovah at Jerusalem, and in all the temples of the numerous gods that were adored in Chaldea, in Arabia, in Egypt, at Athens, and at Rome. But aromatics and spices, with the ancients, were used not only in public worship. They were deemed invaluable for the health and ornament of the body while living, and for its funeral rites. The Romans were accustomed to burn the bodies of the dead; and it became a matter of vanity, or of respect for the dead, to accompany the funeral obsequies with a large quantity of aromatics. The dead body and the funeral pile were covered with the most valuable spices. At the funeral of Sylla, two hundred and ten "burdens" of spices were strewed on the pile. Nero is said, at the funeral of Poppœa, to have burned a quantity of cinnamon and cassia greater than the countries from which it was imported produced in a year. "We consume in heaps," says Pliny, "these precious substances with the carcasses of the dead; we offer them to the gods only in grains."* The Egyptians

* Nat. Hist. Lib. xii. c. 18. It is true that frankincense was at first introduced into Europe not from India, but from Arabia. But it is now well known that the Arabians not only

too embalmed their dead; and the materials for embalming were chiefly the productions of the East. The catacombs of Egypt, it is said, now furnish articles of fuel in the vast quantities of aromatics that were employed in embalming the dead.

The process of embalming was first described by Herodotus, who visited Egypt about 460 years before Christ. The custom of embalming the dead among the Egyptians, so as to preserve the body for thousands of generations, arose from the doctrines of their religion, in which it was taught that the continuance of the soul in a state of blessedness was contingent upon the preservation of the body. When *that* perished the banished soul had to begin anew its career in connexion with physical existence, and after migrating again through various forms of being for 3,000 years, ultimately became reunited with the human form—to go over again the same precarious mode of being.* It was from this opinion that so much care was evinced to preserve the human body. My purpose does not require me to state the process of embalming further than may be connected with the commerce of the East The immense amount of aromatics of various kinds employed in embalming the millions who now repose in the catacombs of Egypt must have been borne there by an extended and an active commerce. A small part of the materials were produced in Egypt. Some were produced in Arabia; and much was brought through Arabia, and other thoroughfares from India. As early as the time of Joseph (B. C. 1729,) we learn that Ishmaelites passed through Canaan on their way

---

furnished to foreign merchants the productions of their own country, but also those of higher value which they brought from India. In every ancient account of the commodities of India, spices and aromatics hold a conspicuous place. Strabo, Lib. ii. p. 156, also Lib. xvii., asserts that the greater part of the spices imported were not the production of Arabia but of India. In the Augustan age, an entire street in Rome was occupied by those who sold frankincense, pepper, and other aromatics. Hor. Epis. Lib. ii. 1, 269, 270.

> Deferar in vicum vendentem thus, et odores,
> Et piper, et quidquid chartis amicitur ineptis.

* Note of the Editor of the Pict. Bib. on Gen. 4: 2.

to Egypt, "bearing spicery, and balm, and myrrh, going down to carry it to Egypt." Gen. 37: 25. This was probably for the purpose of embalming, and was perhaps in part the production of Gilead, but more probably these merchants were, to a considerable extent, mere carriers, bearing to Egypt the productions of countries still further East. "Here," says Dr. Vincent, "upon opening the oldest history in the world, we find the Ishmaelites from Gilead conducting a caravan loaded with the spices of India, the balsam and myrrh of Hadramant; and in the regular course of their traffic proceeding to Egypt for a market. The date of this transaction is more than seventeen centuries before the Christian era, and notwithstanding its antiquity, it has all the genuine features of a caravan crossing the Desert at the present hour.* The articles enumerated here are, 1, "Spicery,"— נְכֹאת—rendered by the LXX *θυμίατα*, and by Aquila *στύραξ*.—The Arabic is *gum*—كَمْأَة.—The Hebrew word denotes properly a breaking to pieces, hence *aromatic powder*, and is here a generic word to denote spices, or aromatic subtances. The Syriac in this place is ܪܶܛܺܝܢܶܐ—*ῥητίνη*, *Retine*—rendered by Walton *resina*, and probably denoting some resinous substance, obtained from a species of pine or of the terebinth tree. Frankincense is obtained from a species of the fir, and the *Nechoth* referred to here may have been a species of frankincense employed for the purpose of fumigation, or it may have been a resin employed for the purpose of embalming. Palestine and the adjacent countries produced the terebinth tree in perfection, and it is not improbable that this may have been a production of that country. 2. *Balm*—צֳרִי. Vulg. *resinam;* Sept. *ῥητίνη*—*resin*. The Hebrew word means *opobalsamum*—balm of Gilead, distilling from a tree in Gilead, and used in medicine. Bochart, Hieroz. T. 1. p. 628.—The tree producing this is almost peculiar to the land of Judea. A small piece of this is said by Theophrastus to be so odoriferous that it will fill a large space with its perfume. He says that in his time it was produced only in two small enclosures in some part of Syria.—*τὸ δὲ βάλσαμον γίνεται μὲν ἐν τῷ αὐλῶνι τῷ περὶ Συρίαν.*

* Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients, Vol. II. p. 262. Pict. Bib. Vol. I. p. 102.

Bruce, however, describes it as growing in Azab, and all along the coast of Babelmandel. The balsam of Gilead is about fourteen feet high, with diverging branches that bear leaves at their extremities. The fruit is a berry, of an egg-shape, marked with four seams, and with two cells.—3. *Myrrh*—Heb. נטף. Vulg. *stacten;* Sept. *σταχτῆ*. This is obtained from a species of *balsamodendron*, a native of Arabia. It forms stunted groves, which are intermingled with acacia, moringa, etc. The gum is fragrant, and is gathered from the leaves.—All these productions are similar in their nature, and were all adapted to the purpose of embalming, and were no doubt conveyed to Egypt with that view.

This traffic thus early commenced must have been carried on during the succeeding ages, and constituted a profitable trade with the Egyptians.—They received in return, corn, the productions of fine linen, robes, carpets, etc. The Egyptians themselves, like the Chinese, carried on no foreign commerce. They abandoned the navigation of the sea to others; but it was their policy, like the Chinese, to make it the *interest* of other nations to trade with them, and to bring them the productions of their climes. In subsequent periods they had the control of no small part of the commerce of Greece and Rome by the dependence of those countries on them for corn.

Herodotus, (II. 86.) in describing the process of embalming, mentions the following materials as being employed, which may serve to illustrate the nature of the commerce that was carried on with that country. "They cleanse the intestines thoroughly, washing them with palm wine, and afterwards covering them with pounded aromatics—*θυμιήμασι περιτετριμμενοίς*: they then fill the body with powder of pure myrrh, pounded—*σμύρνης ἀκηράτου τετριμμενῆς*, and cassia—*κασίης*, and all other perfumes except frankincense; *πλὴν λιβανωτοῦ*. Having sown up the body, it is covered with nitre for the space of seventy days, which time they may not exceed; at the end of which period it is washed, closely wrapped in bandages of cotton, dipped in a gum—*τῷ κόμμι*, which the Egyptians use instead of glue." Considering the vast population of Egypt, the commerce in aromatics for the purposes of embalming alone must have been very considerable.

I have already remarked, also, that great quantities of aromatics were used by the Romans and other nations in burning the bodies of the dead. A few passages from the classic writers will show the extent to which this prevailed, and the importance of the fact in estimating the extent of the commerce with the East. *Oil* was used to anoint the dead. So Homer (Il. Σ.) says, *Καὶ τότε δὴ λοῦσαν τε, καὶ ἤλειψαν λίπ' ἐλαίῳ.* So Virgil, (Æn. vi. 219,) Corpusque lavant, frigentis, et unguunt. Myrrh and cassia were used. Thus Martial (x. 97) says, Dum myrrham et casiam flebilis uxor emit. Thus also *amomia*, whence the word *mummy*, was used. This was an herb—usually called Jerusalem, or ladies' rose. It was produced in Armenia, and must have constituted an article of Eastern commerce. It was mingled with their spices when they embalmed the dead, or when the dead were prepared for burning.—Assyrio cineres adolentur *Amomo Statuis*, Syl. Lib. ii. So Persius (Sat iii.) says,

> Tandem beatulus alto
> Compositus lecto, crassisque lutatus amomis.

A passage from Tibullus will show not only the prevalence of the fact, but also the origin of the spices which were used, illustrating the position that they constituted a part of the commerce of the East:

> Illic quas mittit dives Panchaia merces
> Eoique *Arabes, dives et Assyria*,
> Et nostri memores lachrymæ fundantur, etc. Lib. iii. Eleg. 2.

So Ausonius (Heroum, epitaph. 36):

> Sparge mero cineres, bene olenti et unguine nardi,
> Hospes, et adde rosis balsama puniceis.

Nard, an Oriental production, usually obtained in the Indies, was sprinkled on the flame when the dead body was burning.

> Cur nardo flammæ non oluere meæ? Propertius, Lib. iv.

> Unguenta, et casias, et olentem funera myrrham
> Thuraque de medio semicremata rogo, etc. Martial, Lib. xi. Epig. 55.

Honey was also used to preserve the bodies of the dead. Pliny, lib. xxii. cap. 24. So Xenophon says, that when

Agesipolis king of Sparta died, he was laid in honey—*ἐν μέλιτι τεθείς*, and was borne to the royal sepulchre. So Statius (Lib. iii. Syl) says,

> Duc ad Æmathios manes, ubi belliger urbis
> Conditor, Heblaeo perfusus nectare, durat.

Other quotations of a similar import may be seen in Ugolin's Thesaur. Ant. Sacra, Tom. xiii. 470, seq.

Great quantities of balsam, myrrh and spices were also used, as is well known, in adorning the person, being employed in various kinds of unguents—and these constituted of course a part of the commerce of the East.

> Jamdudum *Tyrio* madefactus tempora Nardo. Tibull. Lib. iii. Eleg. 6.
>
> Si sapis *Assyrio* semper tibi crinis amomo
> Splendeat. Martial, Lib. viii. Epig. 76.
>
> ———hirsuto spirant opobalsama collo. Juvenal, Sat. ii.
>
> Pressa tuis balanus capillis. Hor. Lib. iii. Od. 29.
>
> Myrrheum nodo cohibere crinem. Od. 14.

The *origin* or *source* of some of these articles of luxury is indicated by the quotations above, and also by an expression in Sidonius Apollonar :

> *Indus* odorifero crinem madefactus amomo.

Myrrh was also used in wine, to make it more powerful. Thus Ælien, (His. Lib. xii. c. 31,) says, *μύρῳ οἶνον μιγνύντες οὕτως ἔπινον.*—That vast quantities of aromatics were used by the Romans as articles of luxury, it is not needful to demonstrate. The following passages may be referred to as additional proofs and illustrations. Hor. Od. xiii. Martial, Lib. iii. Epig. 82. Lib. ii. Epig. 12. Seneca, Thes. Act. v. Lucan, Pharsa. Lib. x. etc. etc. See Ugolin. Thesau. Sacra. Ant. Tom. xiii. pp. 462—468. In numerous instances the *East* is indicated as the source of these articles; in nearly all they were probably derived from oriental regions, and constituted a part of the traffic with India.

Precious stones and pearls constituted also an important item in the ancient commerce of the East. They are articles almost wholly of mere luxury; but the world has always manifested a reluctance to have that commerce restricted or circumscribed. Especially were they held in

high value by the Romans. Pliny arranges and defines them; and the immense number which he describes, (Nat. Hist. Lib. ix. c. 35,) shows the extent to which the traffic was carried in his time, and its value as a part of the commerce with the East. India was the country whence these were brought at first; and it was supposed to be the part of the earth where they were produced in greatest profusion.

Pearls, in ancient times, were regarded as valuable to an extent which now almost surpasses belief. Julius Cæsar presented Servilia, the mother of Brutus, with a pearl for which he paid a sum equal to forty-eight thousand four hundred and fifty-seven pounds. The famous pearl earrings of Cleopatra were in value one hundred and sixty-one thousand four hundred and fifty-eight pounds. Robertson's India, p. 25. Ed. N. Y. 1829.

Gold, too, was a part of that commerce. The gold of Ophir, wherever that was, was proverbial. The Mexican mines were yet unknown; and when Columbus became acquainted with the existence of gold in vast quantities in the Western world, he regarded it only as a new proof that he had been successful in reaching India by steering his course to the West. In regard to the commerce with Ophir, I shall endeavor to illustrate it further when I come to consider the ancient commerce of the Hebrews.

Another article that was in great demand, and that early constituted a part of the merchandise that was conveyed through Western Asia, was silk. The practicability of raising the Morus Multicaulis was not then tested in Europe, *as it is now with us;* and the ancients were obliged to import it from distant lands. It was confined however to the rich. Princes and the most wealthy alone could wear it. Its regular and fixed price for ages was its weight in gold. This price continued to the time of Aurelian; and what is remarkable is, that for centuries no advance was made either in learning from what countries it was produced, or what was its nature. It was not until the sixth century that the real nature of silk became known at the west. By some, it was supposed that it was a fine down adhering to the leaves of certain trees or flowers; by others it was supposed to be a delicate species of wool or cotton; others conjectured that it might be the production of a species of insect. Silk was regarded as a dress too delicate, and too ex-

pensive for men,* and was at first appropriated only to women of rank and opulence. Elagabalus was the first who disregarded this ancient and settled rule, and who made it the dress of men. It was for a long time obtained from China, and constituted an important item in the commerce that was carried on through Western Asia. Till the reign of Justinian the silk worms which feed on the white mulberry tree were confined to China: those of the pine, of the oak, and the ash were common in the forests of both Asia and Europe, but their culture was generally neglected, except in the little island of Ceos near to the coast of Attica.† Virgil seems to have supposed that it was a soft wool that was combed from the leaves of trees—but whether produced *on* the leaves as a vegetable substance, like cotton, or spun by insects, and left there either in threads or in cocoons, it is impossible now to determine:

Velleraque ut foliis depectent tenuia Seres? Geor. ii. 121.

The common opinion is, that he regarded it as a vegetable production. The opinion of Servius, however, is that it was the production of insects. Apud Indos et Seres sunt quidam in arboribus, vermes et bombyces appellantur, qui in aranearum morem tenuissima fila deducunt, unde est *Sericum*.‡ The Jews affirm that silk was known in the time of Abraham, and that it constituted a part of the wealth of that patriarch. In *Bereschit Rabbah*, Parascha. xl. it is said, 'It happened when Abraham went down to Egypt, that the Egyptians saw him. But where was Sarah? She was secreted in a box. But when he came to the receipt of custom, they said to him, Pay tribute. He answered, I will pay tribute. They said to him, You carry garments. He answered, I will give you of my garments. They said to him, You carry gold. He answered, I will pay it of my gold. They said to him, You carry *raw-silk*—משי—he answered, I will pay it of the silk. They said, You carry pearls; he answered, I will pay it of the pearls. They said, This cannot be done; but open and show to us what you have in your box. But when he opened the box the whole land of Egypt was illuminated!' As a specimen of trifling, this

* Tacit. Annal. lib. ii. c. 33.

† Gibbon, iii. p. 33. Ed. N. Y. 1829.

‡ Ugolin. Thes. Sac. Ant. xii. 878.

is remarkable. As a tradition, it may have possibly a slight value.* Silk was conveyed to Europe by caravans. An article so valuable and so light was capable of defraying the expenses of a land carriage; and caravans traversed the whole latitude of Asia with it. This journey, in the time of Justinian, occupied about two hundred and forty-three days from the Chinese Ocean to the sea-coast of Syria; but the traffic was conducted in substantially the same way from a much earlier period. *Tyre* was the natural seaport of this silk commerce, and the silk, after being colored at Tyre, and greatly enhanced in value, was then transmitted to Europe †

Ivory, though a heavy article, also constituted a part of the commerce with the East. Thus Virgil says,

India mittit *ebur*. Georg. i. 57. Comp. Ezek. 27: 6, 15.

I shall refer to this again when I come to consider the commerce of Tyre.

I have said that the country which I am describing was favorably situated for commerce. It is so still. And had the government of that land been like our own; had the iron yoke of despotism never been laid on those countries; had the steam-boat been first launched on the Euphrates, the Nile, and the Red Sea instead of the Hudson, the Mississippi, and the great lakes of America; and had the iron road been first laid down there, no one can estimate the wealth and power of those regions now. Babylon was in the direct line from India to the countries of Europe. It commanded the fertile regions of Armenia, and the countries adjacent to the Caspian Sea, and had a direct communication with the Indian Ocean. Tyre commanded the Mediterranean, and was the natural harbor for the traffic of the East, as it was borne up the Euphrates and across the desert through Palmyra to the West. Petra at one time, when that commerce passed through Arabia, rose to splendor and affluence from the same cause, and had similar advantages. The steam-boat, and the rail-road, there, under a different

---

* See Ugolin. Thesau. Sacra. Ant. Tom. xiii. 184, 185.

† See Gibbon, vol. iii. 33—36; Vincent on the Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients, and the authorities referred to in Robertson's India, Note 24.

government, would regenerate that whole region, and renew the beauties of the Eden that was once planted there.

A few remarks—and they must be very few—on the places that were in fact most distinguished for commerce in Western Asia, will prepare the way for the contemplation of the changes which have since occurred there; and the causes of those changes.

Beginning at the East, Babylon, on the Euphrates, is the first city that attracts attention. I shall not describe its extent, its walls, its towers, its brazen gates, its gardens, its capture, its decline. It is only as a place of commerce that we are now concerned with it. It was in a most fertile region—at least it was so once. "Of all countries," says Herodotus, and this was after he had visited Egypt, "of all countries which I have visited, this is by far the most fruitful in corn." (I. 193.) It was early the seat of extended manufactures, and of commerce. Tapestries, embroidered with figures of griffins, and other monsters of eastern imagination, were articles of export. Carpets, which the luxury of all Asiatic nations has always made necessary, were wrought there of the finest material and workmanship, and formed an extensive article of exportation. The tomb of Cyrus at Pasargada was adorned with them. Babylonian robes, esteemed for the fineness of their texture and the beauty of their purple, were a part of the dress of the royal family of Persia. The merchandise of the East we are told by Strabo and Herodotus passed through Babylon, and thence to Asia Minor. And situated as Babylon was, in the centre of a fertile region, and having easy access to the sea, and lying between India and Europe, it owed its greatness not less to its commercial advantages than to its conquests, and its being the capital of a great empire.* The same

* In respect to Babylon as a place of commerce, and the articles which were manufactured there, as well as the nature and extent of its exports, I need do no more here than to refer the reader to a learned and very satisfactory article by F. M. Hubbard in the Biblical Repository, Vol. VII. pp. 364—390. A careful perusal of that article would prepare the way better to appreciate the remarks which I propose to make in another part of this article on the present state of Babylon as a place of commerce.

was true of Seleucia, which succeeded it in importance as a city, and subsequently of Bagdad, the capital of the caliphs. It still was remote from human habitations, and in the midst of a wide waste of sands.* It was built on a beautiful oasis, and it was a convenient resting place for the weary caravan laden with the merchandise of the East. Solomon built it in his general purpose to secure that commerce, and it rose to be one of the most beautiful cities of the Oriental world. The name which Solomon gave to it was retained until it was conquered by Alexander, who changed its title to that of Palmyra—the city of palm trees. "This cultivated spot," says Gibbon, "rose on the barren desert like an island out of the ocean. The air was pure, and the soil, watered as it was by springs, was capable of high cultivation. A place of such singular advantages, situated between the Gulf of Persia and the Mediterranean, was soon frequented by the caravans which conveyed to the nations of Europe the rich productions of the East. It rose to an independent and opulent city, and connecting the Roman and Parthian monarchies by the mutual benefits of commerce, was suffered to observe an honorable neutrality, till at length, after the victories of Trajan, the little republic sunk into the bosom of Rome, and flourished more than a hundred and fifty years in the subordinate, though honorable rank of a colony. It was during that peaceful period that the Palmyrenians constructed those temples, palaces and porticoes of Grecian architecture, whose ruins, scattered over an extent of many miles, have excited so much the curiosity of travellers."†—The reader of history will at once remember that this city was the residence of the celebrated queen Zenobia, who so long resisted the arms of Aurelian, and who evinced so much skill in government and so much power in her armies, as for a long time to turn back the tide of war that was sweeping every thing before it. Here too, protected

* It was situated, according to Pliny, (Nat. Hist. v. 21,) five hundred and thirty-seven miles from Seleucia, and two hundred and three from the nearest coast of Syria. According to Dr. Robertson, however, the distance from Palmyra to the Euphrates was eighty-five miles, and from the Mediterranean was one hundred and seventeen. Disqui. on India, p. 22.

† Decline and Fall, I. 173.

by her, yet finally betrayed by her, Longinus lived, and was condemned by the fierce and unlettered conqueror Aurelian to death. Gibbon, I. 173, 174.

That the city so celebrated as Palmyra was the ancient Tadmor built by Solomon, there can be no doubt. The erection of such a city, so remote from Palestine, and for the purposes of commerce, is one of the most remarkable events in Jewish history, and is a striking illustration of the advantages which it was supposed would result from securing the commerce of the East. (2 Chron. viii. 4.) Major Rennel, in his work on the 'Comparative Geography of Western Asia,' has entered into an elaborate investigation in order to determine the geographical site of Palmyra. According to him, it is in N. Lat. 34° 24′, and E. Long. 38° 20′, being 90 geographical miles to the north of the Euphrates, and 109 miles E. by N. from Baalbec. It is situated on a small oasis in the midst of a vast desert of sand, where there are no other than Arabian footsteps. The spot where Palmyra stands enjoys the advantage of a good supply of wholesome water. Its site is not however to be understood as quite open to the desert in every direction. To the north and north-west there are hills, through which a narrow valley about two miles in length leads to the city. On each side of this valley occur what seem to have been the sepulchres of the ancient inhabitants. They are marked by square towers, and are found to contain mummies like the tombs of Egypt.—The site on which the city stands is slightly elevated above the surrounding desert for a compass of about ten miles; which the Arabs believe to coincide with the extent of the ancient city, as they find ancient remains wherever they dig for that purpose.

Palmyra had no natural advantages as a city except what it derived from commerce. It had no self-sustaining power. It was wholly dependent on the traffic that was carried on between Asia and Europe. Yet it was not merely *a thoroughfare*, or *a resting place;* it became an emporium—a city of merchants. The caravans of the East were undoubtedly directed to Tyre; and Hiram, the Prince of Tyre, might easily persuade Solomon of the advantage which would accrue to him if there were a fortified city on his frontier for the protection of his own kingdom, and for the safeguard of the caravans across the desert.—Palmyra soon became

a place of merchandise; and the merchants there became the factors for the oriental trade. They probably bought of the caravans from India, and sold to the Romans, and under this trade it rose to be one of the most beautiful cities of the world.—It is not needful to attempt further to specify its commerce. Producing nothing itself, its commerce partook wholly of that which has been already described, and it was enriched by that alone.—It is remarkable that it is so seldom referred to in the Scriptures. There are no denunciations of its pride and splendor, as of Petra, and Babylon and Tyre; no prediction of its certain and final overthrow, as there was of theirs.*

Damascus, too, rose in part by that same commerce, and though distinguished by its own manufactures above most of the cities of the East, no small part of its ancient opulence was derived from its situation, and from the fact that it shared in that vast merchandise that was borne across the deserts and plains of Western Asia to contribute to the luxury and splendor of Europe.

Another important city that has perhaps interested the reader of modern travels more than any other is Petra, or Sela. A general description of the site and present appearance of this celebrated city may be seen, by referring to the Biblical Repository, Vol. III. pp. 278—287, 422—431, and Vol. IX. 431—457. All that my purpose requires is, that I should consider its advantages as a place of commerce, and show that it owed its splendor and power to the fact that the commerce of the East at one time centered there. Petra was situated advantageously between Gaza—at one time the mart of commerce, after the destruction of Tyre—on the west, the Persian Gulf on the east, and Palmyra on the north. Thus Pliny (vi. 28) says, Nabatæi oppidum incolunt Petram nomine in convalle, paulo minus II M II. pass. amplitudinis circumdatum montibus inaccessis, amne interfluente; abest a Gaza oppido litoris nostri DC Mill. a sinu Persico CXXXV Mill. Huc convenit utrumque bivium, eorum qui Syriæ Palmyram petiere et eorum qui ab Gaza venerunt.† The situation of Petra as advantageous for

* For a description of Palmyra, see the Pictorial Bible on 2 Chron. 8.

† See Reland's Palest. on the word *Petra*.

commerce, is thus described by Dr. Vincent. "Petra is the capital of Edom or Seir, the Idumea or Arabia Petræa of the Greeks, the Nabatea, considered by geographers, historians and poets, as the source of all the precious commodities of the East. The caravans, in all ages, from Minca in the interior of Arabia and from Gerrha on the Gulf of Persia, from Hadramant on the ocean, and some even from Sabea or Yemen, appear to have pointed to Petra as a common centre; and from Petra the trade seems to have again branched out in every direction to Egypt, Palestine and Syria, through Arsinoe, Gaza, Tyre, Jerusalem, Damascus and a variety of subordinate routes that all terminated on the Mediterranean. There is every proof that is requisite to show that the Tyrians and Sidonians were the first merchants who introduced the produce of India to all the nations which encircled the Mediterranean, so is there the strongest evidence to prove that the Tyrians obtained all their commodities from Arabia. But if Arabia was the centre of this commerce, Petra was the point to which all the Arabians traded from the three sides of their vast peninsula."*

In itself, Petra had no commercial advantages. It was remote from any seaport; it had no large river near; it had no internal resources. It was merely from its being a carrying-place, or a thoroughfare, that it derived all its importance. "When caravans came across Arabia from the Persian Gulf, it was at Edom or Idumea that they first touched on the civilized world. A depôt was thus naturally formed there of the commodities in which they traded. This traffic raised Idumea, and its capital, Petra, to a high pitch of wealth and importance."† As the commerce which centered in Petra, however, was substantially the same with that which was conveyed through Babylon and Palmyra, and which I have already described, it is not necessary to go farther into detail. It was *India* that made Petra what it was, and like Palmyra and Tyre it rose to splendor because the commerce of the East at one time centered there, and, like them, when that commerce received a new direction, it lost its importance and fell to rise no more.

[*To be continued.*]

* Commerce of the Ancients, Vol. XI. p. 263, as quoted by Keith, p. 140. † Encyc. Geog. I, p. 16.

ARTICLE V.

The Characteristics of English Literature.

By the Rev. N. Porter, Jr., New Milford, Con.

It is no mean heritage, to which we have been born, that we have the English language for our mother tongue. It may well be questioned, whether it is surpassed by any ancient or modern language, either in the measure of its capacities, or the readiness with which it adapts itself to uses the most varied. We freely acknowledge the almost *endless* copiousness of the wonderful Greek, and are entranced with the surprising perfection of its structure. We are excited by that vivifying energy which causes a German sentence to beat as with the pulsations of life, and are startled by those meaning whispers which it sends to our ears, as from the spirit-land. But when we turn and read with the eye, or chant with the voice, the poetry of our own Shakspeare and Milton, or mark the graceful ease and the majestic strength which run along the prose of Bacon, of Dryden, and of Burke, we are satisfied more than ever with our own language, and pause, before we yield to any other a higher place.

True, the English is our mother tongue—and we should not forget, as we judge of its sweetness and its power, that our infant lispings first labored to utter its words, and that by its measures, as warbled from a mother's voice, we were lulled to our childhood slumbers. Its familiar household words have become so identified with the realities which they describe, and the emotions which they awaken, that when clothed in a new language, we hardly know them as our own. On the other hand we may not forget, that its words have become so common to our ears by early and constant use, that we are insensible to much of the sweetness which is borne upon their sounds and the power which their combinations enfold;—that he who in his maturer years, acquires a new language, sees in it a freshness

which has been worn off from his own, by the soil of frequent handling.

As is the English language such is the literature, of which it is at once the armor of strength and the glittering robe of beauty. I have spoken of the perfection of the language, because language and literature ought never to be considered apart from each other. The one is the body, the other the spirit. By a mutual influence, they act on each other, and, advancing with an equal pace, they carry each other forward, to a common point of splendid attainment.

But what is literature? It is not what it is thought to be by those who abuse and dishonor its name, by applying it exclusively to certain elegant productions of the intellect, which it is well for the idlers among the educated to furnish, and for the rich to be amused with, and to pay for. To prosecute literature as a business or a profession, is, in the judgment of such, to be studious of the niceties of language, to be able to construct grammatical and well-rounded prose, or, perchance, to attain to the mysteries of rhyming, without doing outrage to the laws of versification. It is the fit occupation of those who dwell in the mansions of ease and of elegance, or those who are content to lodge in garrets, that they may purchase a dinner at the tables of their patrons, by framing to their praise the prettiness of some sonnet, or extolling their stupidity in a well-sounding dedication.

It has contributed in no small measure to this abuse of the name, and the low estimate of literature, that educated men have too commonly regarded it as a pursuit which it is well that masters and misses in their teens should be amused with, but which, though it includes the triumphs of language as uttered in eloquence or sung in verse, is yet unworthy the studious regard of the man who is engaged in the sterner conflicts of real life.

Strange as it may seem, even those, the chief weapon of whose power over man is thought made visible in language, have deemed an acquaintance with language, as Milton and Burke have made it the fit garb for their glowing and sublime conceptions, to be a merely elegant accomplishment. Yes, statesmen, and lawyers, and the messengers of God to man, though by language as the vehicle of thought do they attain the ends of their calling, have thought the study

of their own noble literature to be the fit amusement of a leisure hour, rather than, as it is in fact, the storing together of weapons of terrific brightness and of ethereal temper.

Critics, also, and professed rhetoricians, have furthered this low esteem of literature and its study, and have done much to keep alive this mistaken and dishonorable opinion of its true dignity. Too often, have the very high priests* in this department of study quite mistaken its true elevation themselves, and rendered it a trivial and contemptible thing in the eyes of men at large. And this is not all. The moral and religious teacher has, not rarely, frowned upon the pursuit, the character of which he has so entirely misunderstood, and has reproved it, as a waste of time and a perversion of capacity given for higher and nobler ends. How wonderful! With that book in his hands, on whose pages the prophets, with lips touched with a coal from the altar of God, have recorded their words of hallowed fire and of glowing energy,—on which stand the wondrous letters of the argumentative but fiery apostle, and from which we devoutly listen to the sayings of him who spake as never man spake;—sayings so calm, so thrilling and so true.

What then *is* literature? I answer, it is the product of the mind of man, as made manifest and made permanent by language. It comprehends whatsoever is thrilling and powerful in eloquence; whatsoever is profound and wise in philosophy; whatsoever is acute in argument; whatsoever is grave and instructive in history.—It embraces also all that is delightful in fiction, and that is enchanting in the strains which poets sing, and, in addition, all that is wild in romance and stirring with mirth or sorrow, in the drama. Whatsoever has been conceived in thought, and has received the adornment of varied and beauteous imagery and the strength of powerful expression, and then passed upon the lasting records of time—*that* is literature. The literature of an age, is a collected representation of the philosophers, the civilians, the divines, the moralists, the orators and the poets of that age—who have been distinguished by uncommon genius, and honored to leave upon the age the token of their presence and the impress of their influence.

---

* French critics.

The *literature* of *a people* is the record of the gifted men of every age, who have lived among them, and made themselves felt upon them; either as they have been first studied with reverence in the closet—and through the minds of those who there read them exerted an indirect influence upon the heart of the community—or as their pages have been soiled in the work-shop and torn by hands hardened at the plough.

The distinctive character of the literature of one people, as far as it differs from the literature of another, must be mainly decided by the character of the nation itself. Whatsoever a people is, such is its literature; whatsoever it is in its principles, its aims, its springs of action and its estimates of greatness; and whatsoever also it is, in its morals and manners, so will it be represented in the productions of those who write with an honest mind, and who seek by their writings either to please or profit their countrymen. Every man who writes is *of* the people, and though he possesses his own peculiarities as an individual, yet he cannot but have much in common with his nation. What is more important, he writes *for* the people, and of course must speak to their ears, if he expects to gain a hearing. True, his genius must mould and command them at its will, but it must move upon them *as they are*, or it will not move them at all.

As, therefore, we consider the characteristic features of English literature, we must ask, what are the English people as a nation; or wherein are they strikingly distinguished from every other people; and how have these national characteristics impressed themselves upon their literature?

The English people are a reflecting people. Their actions, their purposes and themselves, they subject to a rigorous and thorough examination—and mould and shape them according to its result. Their object is not to think for the sake of thinking, but to attain its *end*. They do not discriminate in order to sharpen their acuteness, nor do they speculate, that they may gratify the intellective faculty, but their aim is truth. Of course they believe in the reality and the importance of truth;—that there are principles, in regard to every matter, which, if seized by a strong and retentive grasp, give the secret of happiness and success. By no characteristic are they more strikingly marked, than by their hearty and honest attachment to truth. As a nation they

are most abhorrent of quackery, of quackery in any and every shape—in business, in politics, in morals, and in religion. Now and then they are imposed upon, it is true. Through the excess of his self-confidence, the old gentleman, Mr. Bull, is sometimes taken in, after a manner, which makes all his neighbors, who pretend to less circumspection, to shout with laughter as they tell of it. The mortification however does him all the more good. It serves to strengthen his attachment to the true, which has been so sorely wounded. In matters of business, as they think much and seek to think aright, the English are distinguished by a penetrating sagacity, and a marvellous foresight of the results of things, which to their less calculating neighbors appears to be almost supernatural. That which leads the gayer Frenchman to complain of his neighbor, for being everlastingly so serious,—and the speculating German to find fault that he is always so practical,—is yet something which places him far before either, or both united, when any thing is to be accomplished. In questions of politics, while he is ever driving at principles, he is not particularly fond of constitution-making, and rests satisfied with his common law and his British constitution, *because they work so well.* In questions of morals—religion—he asks, What says conscience, and what the written word? He looks very gruffly at the Frenchman, who tells him there is no such thing as conscience,—at the German, who turns the Bible into moonshine,—and at the high-souled Spaniard, who errs through excess of faith. In the high inquiries of mental and moral science, he very quietly suffers twenty German professors to write tomes upon tomes "on truth as refracted through tobacco-smoke;" and half as many Frenchmen to go mad with convulsive ecstasy, at their amazing sublimity and depth, and holds fast to his Locke and his Reid, even though Kant and Cousin might help him out of some sad troubles, in which his own teachers have left him.

The influence of this peculiarity of the English mind, may be traced in the philosophical and reflective cast, which is present so widely in English literature;—and in that trueness to nature and that justness of taste, which pervades it almost universally. This reflective cast of mind, and desire to rest in truth, is most obvious in all our writers,—and gives a peculiar hue and complexion, even to the gayest, and

those whose object is merely to amuse. It gives a richer sententiousness to their wit, and a more substantial body to their humor. It supplies to our works of fiction. an interest for minds of the gravest cast, and makes them living fountains of practical wisdom. The best English novelists, and of such there are not a few, are remarkable for making a close observation and reflective study of man the basis of their interest and their power. This is eminently true of Scott, and the justly admired Dickens, to say nothing of others who might be named. These invariably give us the true philosophy of man in domestic and social life—and sometimes carry us up to a point from which we behold him in relation to his highest calling and his noblest destinies. No man can be a successful writer of fiction, for the body of the English people, who is not a philosophical observer of man. English poetry, also, in its general excellence and its loftiest and divinest attainments, is deeply indebted to the philosophical spirit, and the tone of correct thinking, which is so characteristic of the English people. The gift of poesy is not a mere facility in stringing harmonious and well-sounding words, or in rhyming with a lively tinkle. No;—it is higher and nobler than this.—Poetry is the fair and splendid flower, which genius shoots forth from the substantial soil of true and reflective thought—the gay and dazzling robe, with which she clothes and adorns the symmetrical form of truth. No man can be a true poet, much less can one be a great poet, who is not a philosophic thinker,—and who has not, with a reflecting gaze, attained a just and fixed view of his inspiring theme.

It may be, that without the reflective faculty, one can succeed in the lower walks of the poet's art,—but he can never attain to its highest achievements. He that speaks to the hearts of men, and expects a response, must have learned what is in the heart, by the long and earnest gaze of his inward eye;—he must have thought deeply and pondered well, upon what he has seen therein. He that has no faith in truth,—who like Voltaire is never moved with earnest feeling in view of objects believed to be realities,—is incapable of writing poetry at all. He may be gifted with imagination, and have learned his power of language from Mercury himself,—but without truth believed in, he has not the substance with which to work—nor the material from

which poetry in its power over man must ever be woven. Never could Shakspeare have written that which makes the heart-strings to quiver with agony, and to thrill with delight,—nor could Milton have carried the soul upward, to the throne and dwelling place of the Eternal,—never could Cowper have diffused over the mind the peaceful quiet of the fireside, and the calm delights of the rural landscape,—nor Burns have run away with our hearts by the witching music of his love-strains, and the wild excitement of his cheerful songs;—never in short could there have been a Shakspeare, a Milton, a Cowper, or a Burns, if the very air which they imbibed from their countrymen, had not taught them to be reflecting men,—that they might so speak, that the heart should listen.

Never will Germany produce such poets as these, till she adds to her unquestioned power of reflection, the higher merit of thinking with correctness,—nor will France, till she learns first to think, and then to think aright.

It is however in the graver departments of literature that English writers stand pre-eminent, and here does the philosophical cast of the English mind fit them most highly to excel. In every form of *discussion*, whether of political, moral or general truth, English writers justly claim to themselves the mastery. No nation can boast of a body of philosophical writing so valuable,—none can display so many treatises and so various, of which principles are both base and superstructure, as the nation from which we are proud to derive our descent.

It is the glory of this one nation, and its grand peculiarity which it shares with none other, that the English stock, in the mother and the daughter land, have ever felt that principles were their life—their dignity—the essential condition of their true well-being. For principles have they thought, debated and written; for principles have they fought and bled and died. This high-souled reverence for principles, and this earnest desire to call them into actual existence and living efficacy, was early fixed in the English stock, and has ever been a marked constituent of the English character. Their history has called it into the most active exercise, and nurtured it to a manly growth,—or rather, they themselves have made their history to be but one sublime record of strenuous and determined efforts, to give to principles their

lawful influence. It has been secured to them by their institutions, or rather they themselves have persisted in animating their institutions, with the life-giving power of principles. From the time when Alfred instituted the trial by jury, have they been seen to secure to themselves the permanent blessing of one lofty truth after another, by enshrining it in the maxims or statutes of law, till at last the whole of their judicial and civil polity has come to be, not as with other nations, a material frame-work of dead power, but a living body, the habitation and the servant of a living soul.

The British constitution has been denied to have a real existence, forsooth, because its letters cannot be traced by the pen, and its articles counted by the fingers. "The genius of the British constitution" has called forth many a sneer as an unreal and imaginary thing. But, when the cry has been rung through the land,—"The constitution is in danger!"—arbitrary kings have been made to feel, and resisting lords to know, that the rights of Britons must be respected, or the earth would yawn to swallow up the throne, the palace and the baronial halls, of which it seemed to be the firm foundation.—And their unwritten common law,—what is that but the majestic voice of the English people, as it has called for equity and reason, in cases which could not be regulated by literal enactments, and in exigencies which could not be provided against by specific statutes? This voice often made itself heard in the ear of a Mansfield, and gave form and spirit to those maxims, which make our own courts the sanctuaries of justice.

With this lofty homage to principles, has been connected a steadfast purpose to discuss them freely—and with a view to make them felt. Freedom to think, and freedom to make known its thoughts, has ever been asserted as the native right of the English mind. True, it has often been denied, and the arm of power has once and again essayed to forbid its exercise, but in vain. Not Elizabeth, with the splendor and majesty of her personal state,—with the wisdom and resources of her unrivalled privy council,—no;—not with the added terrors of the star-chamber, could she prevent the discussion of herself and the matters of her government, and the manifestation of the purpose to make principles, one day, mightier

than power. Nor could Whitgift in the church, with a capacity to rule second only to that of his imperial mistress, and armed with the terror of Ecclesiastical law and the inquisitorial tyranny of the court of the High Commission, keep down this confessed devotion to truth, as higher and loftier than mitred authority. In vain did Charles order to the Tower the leaders of the opposition. The spirit of British Freedom muttered back its smothered indignation, which anon burst forth in the fierce war-cry of open defiance. In vain have the jail, the fine and the pillory been employed to punish what have been deemed excesses in the use of this freedom ;—many of which should rather have been pardoned to the spirit of liberty.

Nor have the English people been mistaken in this high regard to principles, and this determined assertion of freedom in making them known, as itself the condition of future prosperity. All that is fair and beauteous in the aspect of merry England ;—all that is substantial in the triumphs of her enterprise, is based upon this, as its hidden but not unreal foundation. All that is more fair and more substantial in the present beauty and prosperity of the daughter land, and that is bright with future promise, is owing to this element of the English character, as it has here made itself more distinctly felt through its more untrammelled freedom, and has erected its splendid structures, in a field unencumbered with the massive ruins of other days.

The influence of this feature of the English mind, thus asserting to itself a being and a field of action,—thus developed in the history of the English race, and matured and perfected in their institutions,—as it has given a character to English literature, is most obvious. Not only has it imparted to every species of writing this peculiar English cast, but it has given birth to hundreds of volumes of a controversial and philosophic character, which stand as noble trophies, erected, as trophies were of old, of the tough and splendid armory which bold knights have employed in the stern and manly strife for truth. To this strife the English mind has ever been girt with a devoted energy ; and its collected results are a species of literature unlike that of every other people. Why need I name in proof and illustration, those ten thousand controversial tracts, political,

theological and moral, which could float in no other air but the free air of England, and which, borne upon its breezes, have rung in the hearing of every fireside circle, and given a new topic of conversation to every ale-house? Why should I speak of the majestic and philosophic eloquence of a Hooker, or the honest ardor and the fervid indignation of a Milton, both mail-clad champions in no fancy tilt, or ladies' tournament; but in the real strife,—victory or defeat. English eloquence has also battled in these stern contests, and has received from them its splendid and unrivalled glories. It is because it has contended for principle, that it has gained its manly tone, its onward directness, its condensed and fiery logic. Hence is it so contrasted with the wordy vastness of the French declaimers, and the passionate fury of their best debaters. In the Parliament it has given us the earnest humanity of Fox, the resistless energy of Chatham, and the far-reaching and majestic philosophy of Burke. In the pulpit, it has left as its memorials the silvery beauty of Bates; the witty pungency of South; the solid and instructive reasoning of Barrow; the searching directness and the apostolic fervor of Richard Baxter.

English History is also eminently philosophical. Conversant as it is with scenes in which principles occupy a place so prominent, and written by those who breathed the air of England, it could not well avoid placing upon its pages the lessons of instructive wisdom. We may not overlook the familiar and popular philosophizing of the British Essayists, who have been influenced by the common characteristic of their nation, and in turn have helped to give it strength.

In Mental and Moral Science, we are told that our literature is sadly deficient,—that England has produced no one worthy to be called a metaphysician,—that though her praise is well deserved for applying principles to practical life as well as to politics and morals, she must take an inferior rank in the sciences of Being and of Mind. That there is occasion for this observation, is doubtless true; that it is a true observation, I altogether deny. The French and German philosophers employ a dialect that is more strictly technical, and assume an air more purely scientific. English writers, as they investigate with a more direct reference to

practical results, wear a more familiar garb, and write in a homelier style, but with no less real science.*

One writer there is, whom England may boast as her own; who is more than an Aristotle or a Plato, for he is both in one, as he unites the divine inspiration of the one with the rigid science of the other. Lord Bacon may justly be placed at the head of all science, and pronounced the sublimest wonder in philosophy, whom the world has yet beheld. He it is, who from the loftiest point of observation, did, as with an eagle's penetrating eye, look over the field of universal science, and pierce to the secret of its hidden mysteries; and who, in his noble ideal, has told us what science must become to attain perfection; with prophetic forecast, striking out the outlines which in part have since been filled, and in part remain vacant still. His thoughts are very oracles; his words are the crystal shrines, which distort not the living being which they embody, but which yet, as the diamond, refract the richest and most varied hues from his sparkling fancy and his high imagination. He is the pure ideal of the English scientific mind, and the faultless model of what the English philosopher should aim to become.

---

* It is hardly becoming, perhaps, to venture an opinion, upon a point so much in dispute as the rival claims of English and Continental Philosophy, where there is little opportunity to support that opinion by extended reasoning. It is, however, a fact beyond all question, that English philosophers have uniformly made the beginning, or given the impulse, which has resulted in the real or fancied improvements in mental science, of which the French and Germans make their boast. It might also be easily demonstrated, that there is little in which they glory as peculiar to themselves, which may not be found scattered, here and there, wrought or unwrought, in the workshops or the rich quarries of English science. It may also be added, that besides those who have won golden prizes for the truth as well as the ability of their investigations, those who have followed a fanciful or false philosophy, have proved themselves to have been by nature most richly gifted as metaphysical philosophers. Such were Hobbes, Berkely, Hume and Brown; men whose writings, if a man study not, or studying does not admire, he proves himself to possess but small pretensions to the name of a philosopher.

The Englishman is not a philosopher merely, he is also a *man*, a *genuine man*, and the intenseness of his humanity has made itself felt in the wide circle of his literature. He is proverbially fond of his home, and around his home are centered his strongest attachments. His paternal oaks and acres, his library, his horses and his dogs are his most valued possessions. He guards with a religious strictness the sanctuary of domestic peace, and the purity of the marriage relation. He counts their audacious violator as the enemy of man, and when he fights for his fireside, he displays an energy that is truly terrific. In domestic life, he studies true comfort, and collects about himself the most abundant sources of quiet happiness. Neatness and convenience are the essential requisites in every apartment,—the simplicity of a just taste invests every arrangement, with a dignified lightness and a sober grace. In intercourse with his fellow men, he dislikes that excess of politeness of which his natural enemy is so fond, because he hates *hypocrisy*. He shrinks with disgust from that unrestrained display of real feeling, which is natural to his less sensitive brother on the Rhine. And yet, though sometimes reserved, he is the truest gentleman. With his apparent coolness and dignity, he is actuated by the moving impulses of the strongest and the most earnest feeling. His attachments, though slow to begin, are ever enduring. His love, though averse to display, burns with an intense and glowing ardor. His reverence for God, for the king and the law, is honest and hearty. His respect for the great and the good he will lose with his life. When these feelings kindle into passion, then is aroused a hatred that is most cordial, a contempt that is most bitter, and an honest indignation, which shakes him to the centre—and all these, with an intenseness, that leaves room for no other thought than the object of his passion, no other feeling than the passion which absorbs his energies. True, he lets off no rockets and displays none of the fire-works of feeling,—no;—*his* passion is too deep for that. To this earnestness of character, there is added the liveliest sensibility to wit, and a genuine vein of humor. He relishes, of all things, a capital joke; the broad humor of the farce and the comic incident which sets the circle into a roar of laughter, he enjoys with a heartiness, which it does one good to witness. But he is far from being pleased when the

joke turns upon himself. Of all men is he the most sensitive to ridicule. He will go to the fire of martyrdom, with greater serenity, than he will face the deserved ridicule and laughter of his fellow men.

Endowed with these varied and apparently opposite characteristics, the English mind is prepared to excel in every department of poetry and fiction. Whatsoever demands vigorous and lofty imagination, fervid feeling, high-wrought passion, condensed and controlled by a severe and delicate taste,—whatsoever also calls for broad and resistless humor or flashing wit, we should know beforehand would be best achieved by the English character, as concentrated and made doubly powerful by wonder-working genius.

That all this has been achieved by English genius, is matter of history. The trophies of her achievements glitter, as they hang along the cloistered recesses, the high-arched halls and the solemn temples, which constitute her spacious dwelling-place. Why need I name her pre-eminence in the drama, which is unchallenged by the world? There is the splendid circle that adorned the age and reign of the maiden queen, whose names may be matched with the greatest of the ancient drama, and with them would stand unsurpassed in the world, were there not one greater than all. The rolls of dramatic genius display but one Shakspeare, rightly styled the myriad-minded, the man who had ten thousand minds in one. Now is he the thoughtful, the high-minded Hamlet, who while he spurns all baseness as pollution, and is nerved with a noble daring to crush it, is yet o'erburdened by his excess of thought, and fails to be equal to the high demands of times so out of joint. Anon he is the fiery Lady Macbeth, not bloody by nature, nor dead to the relentings of her noble self, but hurried on, by the hot impulses of an eager ambition, to the perpetration of that which o'erwhelmed her house in gloomy horror. Then again he dances around the witching caldron of those hags from hell, with shrivelled arms and bony fingers. Anon he floats over our heads, piping to us the wild music of the unseen Ariel; and then moves in the merry measures in which fantastic fairies sport. And yet Shakspeare himself, with his amazing resources, and the transmuting magic of his genius, would not have been what he was, with any

other than the English character from which to collect his materials, nor with any other than that English mind of his own, by which to mould and shape them.

A Frenchman could never have conceived a Hamlet, a Lear, an Othello, or a Fallstaff, as possible existences; for he cannot understand them, now they are furnished to his hand. The dark and contradictory complexity of their natures is also strange to the straight-forward German; who, though strong in feeling and deep in thinking, must yet move upon the direct line of one over-mastering and absorbing passion, but understands not so well the web of passions, self-involved, and the quick and instantaneous transition to opposite emotions. In Schiller we have the German, in Shakspeare, the English drama.

That which gives the English character its peculiar adaptation to the tragic drama, is the presence of its three elements, already named, thought and passion, with a rigid and reserved self-respect. Add to these its deep vein of humor and its delight in flashing wit and lively repartee, and you have the unrivalled English comedy.

In the higher region of poetry purely imaginative, the elements of the power of which are lofty thoughts and sublime conceptions, kindled into an intense and glowing heat by elevated purposes and fervid feeling, who is there, except the Italian Dante, who can be compared with the English Milton? And it cannot be but that Milton's sustained and majestic strength, as it marches forward to the solemn music of his matchless verse, places him upon the loftier height. Talk not of the Iliad, with its heroes bespattered with brains and blood; which, though unrivalled for the charms of its graphic descriptions, the dewy freshness of its images and the wondrous harmony of its verse, is not and ought not to be compared with Milton in sublimity or power. None other than the intellect, the fire and the dignity of the English mind could have produced a Milton. I may not pause to speak of Spenser, with his liquid and harmonious verse and his affluent and delightful imagery, who, though equalled and perhaps surpassed by his Italian master, stands among the poets of England in letters of gold. England's poets have also struck the resounding lyre, with no mean inspiration, and though we claim not that Dryden, and Collins and Gray have surpassed those of other lands, we yet do know

that English fire can strike from its strings the notes that stir the blood, as the sound of a trumpet.

In the lower but pleasant department of fiction we love to trace the presence and influence of our national peculiarities. The master-pieces of Bunyan and De Foe, the Pilgrim's Progress and Robinson Crusoe,—those books which in childhood we read again and again, with such keen delight, and which, if we relish them not now that we are older, we do but confess ourselves insensible to true genius,—these reflect to us the honest English mind, in all its love of truth and its robust and native sense. To say nothing of the novelists of the last century, whom I name not lest I should be misunderstood, he whom we call the magician of the north, a wonder almost as great as Shakspeare, is every inch an Englishman. None but his truly English vein of humor, of sense and dignity, could have strengthened those tastes in the mind of Scott, which, as an inspiring enthusiasm, were the secret of his power. None but true English life and English history could have furnished him with his ample and suitable materials.

The one characteristic, which secures its unfading charm to our lighter and our imaginative literature, is that regard to the truth and propriety of things, which in philosophy aims at scientific truth as its richest jewel, and in social and domestic life secures our comfort, and beauty, and taste. This feature, which I beg leave to call the native good sense of the English character, is the secret of the triumphs of English genius. This saves it from trifling minuteness in little things; from tearing itself in pieces by the violence of its passion, and from rising into mystical bombast, by the excess of its moving force above its regulating power.

Though their neighbors find perpetual fault with the English, for their unmoved coldness, yet the literature of England surpasses their own, in its wonderful sublimity and its passionate fire. That which in a French writer would go off in ranting declamation or incoherent raving, when compressed by English sense, reacts on itself, till it is condensed into a solid and glowing flame: and at last it breaks forth in the lofty propriety of the sublimest imagery, or in the startling energy of passion, which, while it is more than human in its intenseness, is altogether human in the justness of its proportions. The truly English poet, orator, and nov-

elist, make it "a special observance, that they overstep not the modesty of nature," a lesson which writers on the continent rarely, if ever, keep in mind. Hence, while they do much very well, they have done little *so well* as the best of our own authors. An instance from writers, known to us all, may not be amiss. Chateaubriand and La Martine, both men of poetic genius, statesmen and scholars, have given a record of their travels in that fair land,

> "Over whose acres walked those blessed feet,
> Which, eighteen hundred years ago, were nailed,
> For our advantage, to the bitter cross."

They have aimed to give expression to those honest feelings, which its sacred scenes could not but excite. And yet, by overdoing, have they *undone* the whole, while the fascinating Stephens has often, by a careless dash of his pen, moved us to a higher or more tender mood, than pages of over-wrought sentiment.

Who that has followed Milton along his dim pathway "through chaos and old night," across the burning marl of Erebus, upon the solid pavement of heaven, as it thunders to the tramp of the angelic host, led forth to battle by the Eternal Son, has not trembled at the daring of that muse, which could bear the poet so high, lest in some audacious flight she should let him fall, with a sudden plunge, down to the lowest bottom of bathos, though yet she has never lagged in her strong pinions? Or who, that with Lear has felt his own brain almost oppressed with madness, and the universe without to be confounded by a keen and bitter storm, and at last has wept with him in his childish dotage which succeeds so soon, as he bears in the corpse of his abused Cordelia, has not felt the amazing audacity and the easy triumph of English sense, which, as it rises to the height of some great argument, becomes English genius? When also it speaks the language of love, it is ever true to nature, neither sickening her with the mawkishness of that sentiment which forgets its self-respect, nor mocking her with the hypocrisy of affected passion.

To the other characteristics of the English people is to be added one more. It is indeed the spring of some that have been named, and modifies them all. I mean their pervading belief in Religious Truth, and their general sensibility to Religious Obligation. This is true of the English

mind at large ; and should it ever cease to be a fact, then would the greatness and the glory of the English character as certainly decline. There is inwrought, through the framework of social and domestic life, a reverence for its tremendous truths, and a frequent and serious reference to the results of an unseen world. Their views of religion respect it as the purifier of the springs of action and the rightful sovereign of the whole man. They despise as profane mockeries the gaudy pageantry, that fills up the aspirings after immortality, which the Parisian feels, and behold with unaffected horror the solemn splendors of St. Peters, even in the thrilling ceremonial of the holy week. To the honor of the English nation be it said, that neither a skeptical and God-denying philosophy, nor a demoralized and licentious taste has ever gained but a temporary foothold in the heart of the English character.

Religion in its influence upon national literature is of high importance, not so much as it gives a cast to its theology and its books of devotion, but as it enters into the very substance of the national mind, and gives a new form and spirit to the most important elements of the human character. Faith, or belief in things unseen, as a moving spring of action, makes another character to the men and the nation over which it bears rule, giving to their graver emotions a deeper tone, and to their warmer sympathies, a more moving tenderness. Drivelling superstition, by its narrowing influence, enfeebles the powers and smothers them in the damp atmosphere of its gloomy cell. Heartless formality teaches lessons of dishonesty with one's own self, which preclude that freshness of belief and that heartiness in acting, which genius must possess. Skepticism dries up all that gives man his warmer and loftier emotions, and leaves him only capable of contemptuous mockery and savage satire. Faith, as it brings man in contact with objects the most exalted and the most stirring, gives him vigor, by the strong emotions which it calls into being, and the stern conflicts to which it summons him. It gives him enlargement of mind, and makes him to look upward, by an influence that is sublimely elevating.

Never did it happen, never can it happen, that a nation should be possessed of hearty faith, which, other things being equal,—as leisure and opportunity for intellectual

culture and the gift of a perfect language,—will not, in its literature, surpass another in which skepticism and false religion hold the supremacy. Least of all can poetry flourish where faith is not the rich substratum of its earnestness and power;—for poetry speaks to the heart and from the heart. Man is its constant theme, and from man does it expect its response of love and honor. But man, without his moral nature, is not man, and he that professes to utter the language of man's heart, without employing these graver notes, speaks not the dialect of humanity. True, a man gifted with poetic fire and a vigorous imagination, may, as Byron has done, take the master passion of his own soul, and ring eternal changes upon this scanty theme; but those who listen will fail to be moved, except as they sympathize with his depraved peculiarity, or are startled by the fiery vigor of the poet. The man who was his ideal was not man, as man was made to be—passion's lord and not its crouching slave—but man as stirred by fiery passion, nerved with indomitable pride, or chafed with vexing remorse. And yet the noble poet Byron was not a little indebted to his inward seekings after faith, which he could not repress. Though his ideal of a perfect man was incorrect, yet there is an irrepressible longing for peace between his passions and himself, which gives that mournful tone to all his verse which is not its least potent charm. From the depth of his restless spirit there comes up an under tone of mournful wailing which moves upon our sympathy and calls forth our tears. Contrast, with Byron, Scotland's favorite poet and noble son, the intensely human Burns. We need not his letters to tell us that his heart vibrated with most lively sympathy to the stirring realities of the life immortal. Every page of his poetry bespeaks the same convictions intertwined within the fibres of his heart, the same human sympathies beating vigorously in his inmost breast. His ideal of man crowned and beautified his other perfections with the heavenly grace of faith, and though he often wrote that which proved his forgetfulness of what he honored, yet never does he speak with the fervor of his own most serious spirit and the true inspiration of an honest heart, except as he contemplates man as he is allied to an elevated destiny, and holds within himself the awful trust free and accountable will.

Never could Shakspeare or Scott have wrought the wonders which they did, except as they sprung from a people, elevated by hearty religious faith, and as they themselves reverenced, most honestly, its work upon the soul of man. Man as known by them was man with a moral nature, godlike in its capacities for good—terrific in its power for evil. In its triumphs for good are comprehended all holy and blessed affections, all delightful sympathies, all noble and sublime achievements. The world's great dramatist could never have touched the chord of the human heart with such a hand of power, had not he known this master string, to which they all respond with a harmony so divinely sweet, or with which, if out of tune, they jangle with a discord so harsh and horrid.

It is also worthy our notice, that those periods of England's history which have been marked by the prevalence of the intensest religious spirit, are known as the proudest periods for England's literature. Such was the great Eliza's golden time. Then the sacred Scriptures were just unlocked from their dark and dreary prison house, and the common people exulted in the Christian faith, now disencumbered of its monstrous accretions, as it burst upon their sight with the power and freshness of a new revelation. The bright constellation of writers that begirt the splendid throne of Elizabeth, whose names revive to us so much that is honorable in chivalric devotion, and venerable for sageness of wisdom, were men who deemed themselves most ennobled when their intellects and pens were busy with the *divinest themes.* Then appeared that splendid circle of poets, divines and philosophers, as the natural offspring of an age so enriched with manly sentiment, so ennobled by public virtue, and animated by life-giving faith. That age continued for nearly a century, an age of ardent religious feeling and of earnest religious discussion, through the reigns of James and Charles, till it ended in the brief but substantial glories of the commonwealth. It maintained the same essential features; with the exception that it began with loyalty, predominant even to servile subjection, and it ended with liberty, triumphant even to licentious misrule. From its beginning to its end, it ceased not to produce its wonderful abundance of the most splendid names in literature, always characterized by strength of conception, elevation of feeling and

splendor of diction. Had the Latin element less oppressed and encumbered their language, had their sentences been constructed with a more flexible ease, and their thoughts been fitted to each other with a method more natural and more strict, that age would never have been defrauded of its lawful honors.

The century which followed began with the restoration of a licentious monarch and a profligate court. During this period the faith and fervor of the people stood at a lower point, and the tone of morals sadly declined. Infidelity made repeated assaults upon the Christian system in that remarkable succession of writers known by the name of the English Deists, who were repelled rather in the tone of apologetic defenders, than with the fervor of apostolic boldness. English literature during all this time experienced a withering of its strength and a decay of its beauty. It is true the age of Queen Anne is sometimes called the Augustan age of English literature, but less frequently now than was formerly the case. I am not insensible to the real merits of Addison, and Pope, and Swift, but of this I am certain, that if literature is to be tested by its strong and permanent hold upon the heart, by the vigor of its thoughts, the freshness of its images and the force and propriety of its language, then the age of Anne is not by many degrees the noblest age of England's literature. It is true, that at that time the grammar and rhetoric of the language were formally treated of, and applied with more studious nicety. English style was then made pure of certain inconvenient appendages, and moulded into easier and more harmonious periods. But in those features which make a literature worthy of our delight and admiration, this latter period is not for an instant to be compared with the one which went before it. Look at Shakspeare, Milton, Bacon, Fuller, Hooker, Brown, Taylor, Sydney, Harrington, and place by their side Pope, Addison, and Swift,—their very names decide the question.

Of the history of English literature since the year 1760, with its renewed glories, and their not unobvious causes, I forbear to speak.

I must also name the powerful influence which the English Bible, in the wonderful perfection and poetry of its diction, has exerted upon almost every English writer who has been truly great. It has been a perpetual minister of enno-

bling thought and a living fountain of the grandest inspiration. To say nothing of the hundreds, of other times, whom I might name, I mention three of recent fame—Burns, Byron and Scott—who confessedly owe not a little of their intellectual power, and their poetic diction, to the constant perusal of the Hebrew poets.

When it is added that in France, till but recently, a poet of eminence would derive no inspiration from this source, nay, that he would be pardoned if he barely knew that such a book was in being, or even if he sneered at its contents as the collected incoherencies of the barbarous Jews, the reader will not fail to see, that the Protestant faith has exerted no inferior influence, in forming the English character to its peculiar dignity, and the English literature to its peculiar excellence.

Such are the characteristics of England's literature, as it is affected by the Principles, the Spirit and the Faith of the English people. Its other features, those which distinguish it, in common with all the literature of modern times, from that of the ancient world, it was not the design of the writer to consider.

He has to regret that the theme is so extensive, as to admit only of remarks the most rapid and general, and to compel him to leave unnoticed the hundreds of illustrations which have crowded upon him at every step. It is a theme for a series of articles,—one for each age that divides its history, and one for each writer who adorns its splendid roll,—rather than a topic for one brief essay.

The literature of England is a noble inheritance. The world can show no other like it; and it is *our* inheritance. It becomes us to honor the memory of the illustrious dead who have left it as their bequest, and not to be ignorant of the value and extent of the treasures which they have laid up for us in our houses. Enshrined as it is in a language fitted to its high and varied offices, which can sparkle in a song of Shakspeare's, and swell the sublime rolling of Milton's verse, it is a noble repository of just principles and of manly and heroic sentiments. The study of it, not the reading merely, is fitted to discipline the intellect to the sturdiest strength, and to inform the soul with principles of pure uprightness, of self-sacrificing virtue and exalting faith.

He who, with an intellect disciplined by the thorough

study of the classics, and with a taste formed by their faultless models, gives as thorough and severe an attention to the literature and language of his native tongue, will see the amazing wealth of its stores roll out before him in exhaustless profusion, and new and unlocked coffers ever to present themselves, in this golden treasure-house. He may also know, that the continued converse with these mighty minds, cannot but give to his intellect, as long as he shall live, a constant and generous growth. The scholar who has his Milton and his Burke ever open before him, and the poetry of the one and the rich and numerous prose of the other ever upon his tongue, will find himself quickened and elevated into a better intellectual life. The influence of such a course of study upon success, in professional and public life, will be most apparent. The few, here and there, who are known to be studious of the force and beauty of the language which they employ, and to hold constant intercourse with the great minds of English literature, stand by themselves. They are known to possess some high and marked peculiarity, and are confessedly not only masters of the instrument which they wield, but elevated by the peculiar dignity of their intellectual cultivation,

Such were the studies of the late John Randolph, who is known to have given constant and severe attention to the English language and literature. The influence of these studies we trace in the acute and weighty sense which mark the efforts of his earlier days, and the pure and idiomatic English which places him before almost any other American speaker, as the easy and graceful master of his native tongue. Many others of our statesmen and public men have derived the highest advantage from the same plenteous source. Yet not a few of those, whose gifts in eloquence and thought were far higher than his, are inferior to him in the marked superiority which his truly English education imparted to him. The English tongue, as employed by some of our noblest orators, appears to be a coarse and blunted instrument, rather than the finely polished steel, with which it glistens, when it is wielded by his hands.

The page of English literature is open to others, besides the man who aims to realize the high ideal of an accomplished education. It is easy for any man, whatever his circumstances and lot in life, to reserve the time and bestow the

attention that are necessary to make him the master of our leading authors. To be known, they must be thoroughly studied, and he that would derive the fullest advantage from his reading, must read with the spirit of manly reflection. He who, in the discharge of the ordinary duties of life, cherishes a taste for the early and later English poetry, and not a little of its fiction, and makes their words and images the familiar and well-loved inmates of his daily thoughts, cannot but strengthen a spirit of true manliness and noble elevation, as well as store his mind with treasures on which to work, when the excitement of life begins to subside, and its evening twilight is gathering its shades. No man, however humble his lot or meager his fare, has ever read and loved Milton in his earlier years, who has not received by this means a real education of mind and character, as well as stored most important treasures of elevated enjoyment. Especially does it add a new grace to female loveliness, and a deeper and richer coloring to her native charms, to breathe the pure and ethereal air which may be imbibed from the haunts of English poesy. The old and moss-grown wells are not to be forgotten or passed by with neglect, overlaid though they be with massive stones, carved o'er with quaint devices; for beneath them the purest and sweetest water flows.

Let it not be forgotten, that not all which calls itself verse is genuine poetry,—not every one of those things called novels is genuine fiction; and certainly not all, that comes to us in the dress of the English language, reflects the spirit of the true English character.

It is well to be zealous in diffusing just notions of this inheritance of noble writers, and a glowing enthusiasm to transmit their strength and spirit, as it is well to desire that the genuine English character may be maintained, in its native and dignified simplicity, in its self-respecting, yet self-forgetting ardor, and its familiar, yet reverent intercourse with the world of faith. Literary tastes and literary associations exert no mean influence, in deciding the principles, and in regulating the springs of action. It is of no slight consequence whether the tastes, the feelings, the manners, the prejudices and principles of our educated and reading men, are to be moulded and formed in the French, the German, or the good old English school. It may be no less a matter than to decide whether Atheism, which worships

the world of sense and beauty, Pantheism, which denies the moral and responsible nature of man, or the Christianity of the Church and of the Bible, is to be the religion and philosophy of our scholars, our reading men and the nation. It is altogether impossible that there should be a literature which is not based upon a system of philosophy known or unknown, avowed or unconsciously held; and it is idle to despise, as a concern of inferior import, what are the literary studies and tastes that pass current among any people.

Be it the noble aim of every man, that knows enough to do it, to transmit to posterity the rich inheritance which we have received from our fathers; and be it also his aim to add to its rich stores other wealth of the same ore, in its original purity. In so doing, he also keeps alive the noblest and most perfect style of human excellence which the world has yet beheld.

> "It is not to be thought of, that the flood
> Of British glory,—which, to the open sea
> Of the world's praise, from dark antiquity
> Hath flow'd, 'with pomp of waters manifold,'—
> That this most famous stream in bogs and sands
> Should perish, and to evil and to good
> Be lost for ever. In our halls is hung
> Armory of the invincible knights of old:
> We must be free or die, who speak the tongue
> That Shakspeare spake, the faith and morals hold
> Which Milton held. In every thing we're sprung
> Of earth's first blood,—have titles manifold."

ARTICLE VI.

The Philosophy of the Gnostics—its Origin, Nature, and Influence upon Christianity.

By Henry T. Cheever,* Theol. Seminary, Bangor, Me.

There were prevalent in the East, in the time of our Saviour, and had been for several centuries, certain opinions, which, though not then reduced to system, were afterwards known as the Oriental Philosophy. These opinions were chiefly concerned with the origin of evil. It being universally conceded, that from nothing nothing could proceed, the existence of every thing was accounted for by supposing it an emanation from one original, eternal Fountain of Being. From this Fountain, or, in other words, from the Supreme Deity, there emanated two contrary principles—Light and Darkness. But, to save the Deity from the direct authorship of darkness, it was metaphysically conceived, that light could no more exist without darkness, than a visible body without its shadow. Subsequently light seems to have been synonymous with, and to have stood for, all those spiritual substances in the universe, which partake of the active nature of fire, and darkness, for the heavy opaque mass of inert matter. These active and passive principles of light and darkness were held to be perpetually at variance; the former tending to produce good, the latter evil. Through the intervention of the Supreme, it was conceived that the contest would finally terminate in favor of the former.

It was an advance upon this general, indefinite theory, to suppose various orders of spiritual beings to have emanated from the Deity, more or less perfect, according to their distance in the course of emanation. Among these orders the

* We are requested to say, that in the absence of the author, and by his consent, this article has been submitted in manuscript to the Rev. G. B. Cheever of New-York; who has carefully reviewed the discussion and the authorities referred to, and made some valuable additions.—Editors.

human soul was held to be a particle of light, which would return at length to its source, and partake of the same immortality. Matter was conceived to be the last and most distant emanation from the great Fountain of being, and for this reason, it was supposed to have become opaque, inert, and the cause of evil.*

These doctrines had their rise among the Persian or Chaldean Magi, and were probably first formed into something like a system by the Persian Zoroaster, about the year 750 B. C. They became prevalent in Egypt, Asia Minor, and throughout the East generally; and were undoubtedly well known to the learned Jews, especially after the captivity, and the settlement of the Jewish colony in Egypt. They received new and fanciful developments among different nations, and at different times; but through them all was diffused the same primitive idea of emanation. At one time the two opposite principles of light and darkness were impersonated, deified and worshipped, as the antagonist authors of all things; and this was *Dualism.* At another, the dogma that matter was self-existent, eternal, inherently malignant, and the source of all evil, became ascendant, and its votaries had recourse to vigils, fastings, and self-imposed austerities, to break its power, and deliver the imprisoned soul from bondage. Again, closely applying the doctrine of emanation, they constructed a system of Pantheism, believing a part of the great intelligent soul of the universe—the anima mundi—to reside in animals, plants and the elements, and supposing an immediate action of mind upon matter, and a direct communication, by vigils of contemplation, between the human soul and the Supreme. Thence arose the attractive systems of divination, soothsaying, incantation and magic, "through the intervention of the numerous hierarchy of celestial spirits, disseminated over the theatre of the universe."†

The first of these systems—the Persian and Chaldean Dualism—is referred to in Is. 45. "I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God besides me. *I form the light, and create darkness;* I make peace, and *create evil.*

---

* Brucker's History of Philosophy, p. 27.

† Histoire Comparée des Systèmes de Philosophie, par M. Degerando. Tome I. Paris, p. 256.

l the Lord do all these things." That the Jews must have been acquainted with this system, is evident from their close connection with the Babylonians, among whom it prevailed, during their captivity; from the settling of a colony of Jews in Egypt under Alexander the Great, and their gradual mingling with foreigners after that epoch; from the introduction of Babylonish rites, and consequently of Babylonish opinions into the mongrel religion of the Samaritans; and lastly, from the character of the Jewish Cabala, which was deeply tinctured with, if not wholly derived from, the Oriental Philosophy. This system, as it existed about the time of our Saviour, may be reduced to seven principles, which Degerando has thus expressed:* 1. God, conceived as the primitive Light. 2. Two principles, the one of good, the other of evil. 3. The divine substance developing itself in progressive emanations. 4. The mystic marriage. 5. Seven genii or superior spirits—personified attributes. 6. The instrument of the creation distinct from the Creator, and emanated from him, called the word, wisdom, the primitive and celestial man. 7. A spiritual region, and the direct communication of the soul, by rapt contemplation, with the Supreme Intelligence. Perhaps we may add to these, a belief in the pre-existence of souls, a resurrection to a future life, and a limit fixed for the duration of the world."†

Origin of the Gnostic Philosophy.

Prior to the existence of the *Christian* heresies bearing this name, and probably at the time the Platonic philosophers of Alexandria visited the Eastern schools, certain professors of the Oriental Philosophy applied to themselves the term *Gnostics*, to express their more perfect knowledge of the Divine nature. "That they assumed this vaunting appellation, before their tenets were transferred to the Christians"—says Brucker—"may be concluded from this circumstance;

* Histoire des Systèmes de Philosophie, Vol. III. 325.

† For a happy elucidation of the moral causes of the Oriental speculations, see Cook's View of Christianity, Vol. I. 272—282. For a philosophical development of the physical causes of the same, see Mosheim's Commentaries, Vol. II. 180—184.

that we find it among the Christians, not appropriated as a distinct title to any single sect, but made use of as a general denomination of those sects, which, after the example of the pagan philosophers, professed to have arrived at the perfect knowledge of God. The pagan origin of this appellation seems plainly intimated, in two passages of Paul's Epistles. In one he cautions Timothy against *ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως*, the oppositions of false science; in the other he warns the Colossians against a vain and deceitful philosophy which was according to human traditions and the principles of the world, and not according to the doctrine of Christ.* So far the learned are generally agreed. Indeed the use of the term *γνῶσις* in such a manner by Paul would satisfactorily establish the fact, in the absence of other proof, that there were certain philosophical notions then extant under this name. But whether Gnosticism as such, and with the peculiarities that afterwards became more manifest, existed in the first century, is a point about which there has been much dispute. The learned and judicious Mosheim argues, that, "to say nothing of other ancient documents, the Sacred Scriptures themselves put it beyond controversy, that even in the first century, men, infected with the Gnostic leprosy, began to erect societies distinct from other Christians. Yet these stray flocks did not become distinguished for their numbers, or for their fame and notoricty, until the times of Adrian. Under the appellation of Gnostics are included all those in the first ages of the Church, who modified the religion of Christ, by joining with it the Oriental Philosophy in regard to the source of evil, and the origin of this material universe.†

Tittmann, on the other hand, in a tract entitled, "Tractatus de vestigiis Gnosticorum in N. T. frustra quæsitis," endeavors to prove that nothing was known of Gnosticism until the second century. Brucker again is of the opinion.‡ that "the tenets, at least, of the Gnostics existed in the Eastern school, long before the rise of the Gnostic sects in the Christian Church under Basilides, Valentinus and others." "The oriental doctrine of emanation seems frequently

* 1 Tim. 6: 20; Col. 2: 8.

† Eccl. Hist. Vol. I. 110, Murdock's Translation.

‡ Brucker's Hist. Crit. Phil. by Enfield. London, 1837, 8vo., pp. 670.

alluded to in the New Testament in terms which cannot so properly be applied to any other dogma of the Jewish sects. And it appears from the authorities to which the Gnostic heretics appeal that this doctrine was taught in the Apostolic age. These heresies seem to have arisen in Egypt, and to have passed thence into Syria and Asia Minor, where they infected the Church so early as the reign of Nero."*

The truth, we think, lies between the two parties, although nearer to Mosheim and Brucker. The opinions of the fathers are perspicuously noted by Lardner. They seem never to have doubted as to the nature of the references made by Paul.† The learned Buddæus argues at length, that the grand fountain of the Gnostic sects was in the mass of Jewish traditions, drawn mostly from the East, and afterwards collected into a written system.‡ We shall have occasion to quote from his argument. Vitringa, in four admirable chapters on the introduction to the gospel of John, shows conclusively that the Evangelist must have referred to those heresies which soon, in the very bosom of the church, received a permanent form in the system of Basilides and Valentinus. No man can become acquainted with the emanations of the Gnostics, or with their speculations concerning the difference between Jesus and the Æon Christ, their denial that Christ had come in the flesh, and their speculations concerning the creation of the world, without the conviction that John must have had their heresy in view, both in his gospel and epistles. "Who is a liar, but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ?" "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the

---

* Brucker's Hist. Crit. Phil. by Enfield. London, 1837, pp. 6, 70.

† Hæ sunt doctrinæ hominum et dæmoniorum, prurientibus auribus natæ de ingenio sapientiæ secularis, quam dominus stultitiam vocans, stulta mundi in confusionem etiam philosophiæ ipsius elegit. Ea est enim materia sapientiæ secularis, temeraria interpres divinæ naturæ et dispositionis. . . . . Hinc illæ fabulæ et genealogiæ indeterminabiles, et quæstiones infructuosæ, et sermones serpentes velut cancer, a quibus nos apostolus refrenans, nominatim philosophiam testatur caveri oportere. Tertul. De præscriptionibus adversus hæreticos, c. 7.

‡ Dissertatio de Hæresi Valentiniana, § 15, 16.

flesh, is not of God; and this is that spirit of Antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world."* The reader may see, in the work of Vitringa referred to above, the doctrine of the Gnostic Emanations traced, on the authority of Jamblichus, to the Egyptian philosophers; who, not content with the doctrine of Plato concerning the two Emanations, mens et anima mundi, added more. Afterwards came the Basilidian and Valentinian scales of Emanation. It can hardly admit of a doubt that Paul alluded to pagan Gnostic notions in those most appropriate designations, 1 Tim. 6: 20, 1: 4—7, 4: 7; Tit. 1: 14, 3: 9; Col. 2: 8.—"Fables, endless genealogies, vain jangling, profane and vain babblings, oppositions of science falsely so called," etc.† Nor, on the other hand, is the evidence complete, that the Gnostic heresy was openly avowed in the church, and that "societies distinct from the other Christians were erected" so early as the first century.

The account given by Mosheim of "the proper oriental philosophy," in his chapter on the state of learning and philosophy among the heathen nations in the time of Christ, would seem to have been drawn from his own supposition of what was probable, rather than from reality. "The first principles of this philosophy," he observes, "seem to have been the dictates of mere reason. For the author of it undoubtedly thus reasoned,‡" etc.

Now, however, those who were tinctured with its principles might have reasoned, it is perfectly evident that it had no one author; but was a sort of monstrous Eclecticism, gathered from Egypt, Syria, Chaldea, Persia, Arabia, Judea. Neither was it, in its leading principles, so widely diverse from the occidental system, but that points

---

* Adstruxi itaque hactenus duas illas sententias, quarum altera, *Mundum ab Angelis Deo summo inferioribus, creatum esse* statuit; altera, *Christum veram carnem non induise;* vel si induerit, *eidem a primo ortu humanæ naturæ non fuisse individuo nexu conjunctum:* circa extrema tempora Joannis apostoli, quibus ille Evangelium suum composuit, suos jam in Christianismo invenisse fautores et patronos: quas Evangelii Prologo destrui, nemo mihi neget. Vitr. Obs. Sac. 2: 149.

† Mosheim's Com. I. 40.

‡ See Mosheim's History, Vol. I. 74.

of similarity might be found between them, sufficient to constitute a ground of admixture; and both systems, without any great violence to either, might have met and mingled their influences in one common corruption of Christianity. That the followers of the oriental system, however widely they might differ among themselves, arrogated to their philosophical speculations the term γνωσὶς, as signifying, κατ' ἐξοχήν, the knowledge of God and divine things, is altogether probable; inasmuch as that word signified positive knowledge, and might be used for things eternal and immutable. Thus the Gnostic speculators might vauntingly say, "Our philosophy is γνωσις; as an apostle would say, "Our religion is ζωὴ," or as John said of our Lord, "in him is life." Before the creation of any separate Gnostic sect in the bosom of the Church, there might be, and there would be, individual spirits, here and there, seduced by this philosophy, imbued with it, and constantly intruding its tenets on the notice of their fellow Christians, under pretence of a system of γνωσις more perfect than the simple followers of the word of God merely, or of Christ and his apostles, could attain. It would be such delusive teachers to whom the apostle would refer in his warnings against "the oppositions of science falsely so called." Mosheim, in his Commentaries,* inclines to a different view from that presented in his history, supposing that the sects formed by the mixture of oriental notions with Christianity, did not assume a determinate form, acknowledged leaders and peculiar laws before the second century.

From the mingling of the oriental and occidental philosophies at Alexandria, and from the visits of the professors of the latter to the schools of the former, there undoubtedly resulted some modification of the oriental as well as of the occidental scheme. The free interchange of opinions would naturally beget a mutual transfer of notions. While, therefore, it is to be borne in mind, that the oriental philosophy, as such, was the magna parens of Gnosticism, it is yet true, that this latter system was a compound of influences and features from east, west, north and south, Persians and Chaldeans, Jews, Greeks and Christians. If it had one parent, it had many godfathers. Every system

* Vol. I. p. 309.

of philosophy met at Alexandria, the philosophic arena and show-ground of the world, the point of admixture between the doctrines of the eastern and western nations, the scene of the marriage of Platonism with the doctrines of the Jews and the opinions of the East in the writings of Philo.* Thus much is incontestably true, that the seeds of what may be called the Christian Gnostic philosophy were sown in the first century, in a soil well prepared for their reception, by the spread of the oriental notions detailed above. They immediately took root and sprung up, but did not become fully ripe until the second century. Or, to change the figure, Gnosticism was first engendered in the bosom of the Church, early in the first century, through profane contact with the oriental philosophy. The period of its embryon formation extended through that century. The time of its birth and full development was early in the second century, after the decease of the apostles, and under the Emperor Adrian.

Nature of the Gnostic Philosophy.

In the loss of all the original works of the Gnostics themselves, we can become acquainted with them only through the writings of their opposers, and thus, at best, obtain but an imperfect knowledge of their peculiar doctrines. They were singularly blind and far-fetched in their speculations, and, as a natural consequence, were composed of various sects, that differed widely among themselves. All the Gnostics of the second century may, however, be comprehended under three great families: 1. The Syrian, eldest of all, at the head of which were successively Cerinthus, Saturninus, Bardesanes, and Tatian. 2. The Alexandrian, over the different sects of which were Basilides, Valentinus, Carpocrates, and Euphrates. 3. The school of Marcion, sometimes also called that of Asia Minor, although its founder studied in Rome. These held in common certain notions derived from the oriental philosophy. They professed to hold the doctrine of one God, however inconsistent with this truth were their detailed speculations.† They believed in the eter-

* Tenneman. Hist. Phil. § 194, 195, 199. Tertul. de præscrip. advers. hæret. c. 7.

† Lardner's History of Heretics. Works, 8. 320.

nity of matter, and considered this the cause of all evil. They held that the Deity had nothing to do with the reduction of the chaos of matter to order, or the creation of the world out of it, but that this was the work of an inferior being. The bodies of men, of course, came from this inferior creator, but their souls from God; the former destined to return to matter, but the latter, if they threw off the dominion of the creator of material things, to ascend again to the Deity.* In the detail and development of these speculations they differed widely. Some retained more, and some less, of the Jewish dogmas; some held in full to the Zoroasterian principle of evil, and believed it to be the self-existent governor of matter, distinct from the architect of the world.† Various were their fables concerning the conflicts between the Deity and the creator; and innumerable were the controversies and divisions which sprung from the detail and explanation of these systems. As a sort of common, philosophical basis of their speculations, and source of their endless fables and genealogies, the vexed question concerning the origin of evil always lay at the bottom.‡ Their common principles of cosmogony, in things material and spiritual, were the doctrines of emanation from an eternal Fountain of Being, and the creation of the world by a Demiurgus opposed to the Deity, either opposed originally, or become so in consequence of a fallen and deteriorated nature.

They all maintained the existence from eternity of a being, or infinite abyss (*βυθός*) of being, full of power, goodness, wisdom, and all possible perfection.§ Resident within the divine essence, or infinite Fountain of Being, they imagined a series of emanative principles, having a real and substantial existence, connected with the first substance, as a branch with its root, or a solar ray with the sun. When the mysteries of this system came to be unfolded in the Greek lan-

* Mosh. Comm. II. 332.

† Degerando, Tome III. 316.

‡ "Sed quid clarius verbis Epiphanii de Gnosticis discernentis? *Ἔσχε δέ*, inquit, *ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κακῆς προφάσεως τὴν αἰτίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξητεῖν, πόθεν τὸ κακόν*; hujus vero pessimæ sectæ prætextum et initium dedit illa disputatio: UNDE MALUM." Vitringa Observat. Sacræ. Tom. II. 152. See also Tertul. de præs. advers. hæret. c. 7.

§ Mosheim and Brucker.

guage, they called these substantial emanative existences, comprehended within the πλήρωμα which was filled by the divine Plenitude, ἀιῶνες, or Æons, because they believed them to exist substantially and unchangeably.* In this emanative series of Æons, which they conceived to be of two sexes, and consequently capable of multiplying their kinds, they included the Demiurgus or maker of this world; an Æon so far removed from the great Source of Being, as to be allied to matter, and capable of acting upon it. Beyond the boundless pleroma, or region of light filled by the divine Plenitude, there existed a rude, unformed mass of chaotic matter,

> "Outrageous as a sea, dark, wasteful, wild,"

the womb of every species of evil. This wild abyss of matter, the Demiurge, either accidentally wandering beyond the pleroma, or driven out for some offence, or commissioned by the Deity, undertook to reduce to order, to decorate with various gifts, and finally to enrich with a portion of the

---

* *Οὐσίας ἀντὰς καθ' ἀντὰς.* Brucker, 379.—*Αἰὼν* properly signifies indefinite or eternal duration, as opposed to that which is finite. It was, however, metonymically used for such natures as are in themselves unchangeable and immortal. That it was applied in this sense, even by the Greek philosophers at the time of Christ, is plain from Arrian, who uses it to describe a nature the reverse of ours—superior to frailty, and obnoxious to no vicissitude. There was nothing strange, therefore, in the application of the term ἀιῶνες, by the Gnostics, to beings of a celestial nature, liable neither to accident nor change. The term is used even by the ancient fathers of the purer class, to denote the angels in general, good as well as bad. Some commentators of acknowledged erudition and ingenuity, have conceived that ἀιὼν has a similar signification in the New Testament. Paul describes the Ephesians, before they were acquainted with the gospel of Christ, as having walked κατὰ τὸν ἀιῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τόντου, κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἄερος. In this passage, ἄρχων τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἄερος, "the prince of those powerful natures which belong to, or have their dwelling in the air," appears to be one and the same with him who is first spoken of as the Αἰὼν τοῦ κόσμου τοῦντου; and according to this exposition, Αἰὼν must mean an immutable nature." Mosheim's Comm. Vol. I. 56, 57.

celestial light. This Demiurge, having revolted against the Deity, assumed to himself the exclusive government of this material creation, and bestowed the administration of its provinces on a number of genii or spirits of inferior degree, who had been his associates and assistants.

Considering matter as the source of all evil, they supposed the soul, which was derived from the Deity, to be in bondage to the body, and seduced to the worship of the Demiurge, its creator. From this bondage God seeks to deliver it, and recall it to himself; the Demiurge and his associates opposing this divine purpose, and laboring to destroy all knowledge of the Deity. Those souls that renounce the worship of the Demiurge and the bondage of matter, will rise to God, but the others will pass into other bodies in an indefinite transmigration; God, however, will finally prevail, the world will be destroyed, and souls delivered.*

Now the whole foundation of this peculiar system of cosmogony was laid in the tenet that matter is intrinsically evil. This principle seems to have got a deep and wide hold of the oriental mind, so that every philosophical speculation embraced it as a sort of acknowledged axiom. This being the case, it was judged unworthy of the Supreme Deity to interpose in the work of reducing matter to order and beauty. It was impossible that an infinitely good and perfect being could be the author of any thing evil, and as matter itself is evil, and this world full of evil, they chose to ascribe its creation to angels, Æons, or one particular Æon, assisted by others.† The addition of the fable that this creative Æon, himself falling into corruption, revolted from God, was a very natural consequence of setting him at work for the formation of an evil world; and the belief that this revolted Æon, the Demiurge, was the God of the Jews, seems an equally necessary consequence, supposing a belief in the Jewish Scriptures; for there it is taught that the Jehovah of the Hebrews was the Creator of the world. Some of them, accordingly, rejected the Old Testament, as proceeding from the Creator, nor could any, holding their speculations, receive the account of the creation as given by Moses.‡

* Mosh. Comm. I. 57.—Mosh. Eccl. Hist. I. 76.

† Lardner's Hist. Heretics. Works, VIII. 355.

‡ Lardner, VIII. 484.

To aid in the deliverance of souls from the power of the Demiurge and the bondage of matter, they supposed Christ to be an Æon sent from the Supreme Deity. So the followers of Christ are raised to the world of light, while the Jews and the heathen are still in bondage to the Demiurge, or the creator, and to Hyle, or matter. The mission of Christ on earth, and all these general speculations, were variously exhibited in the different schools or sects of philosophy, according to the fertility of their imagination, and their respective leanings to the oriental system, whether Zoroasterian or Cabbalistic, and the occidental, whether Platonic or Christian. Dualism was the characteristic of the former, the doctrine of emanations or filiations, that of the latter.* Some of them forged books under the names of Eastern philosophers, from which they pretended to derive their genealogies of emanations from the divine Being. They pretended to trace their fantastic systems up to Adam in Paradise; and boasted that some of their earliest books were written by the patriarchs, Seth, Noah, Abraham, and other holy men who flourished long before the time of Christ.

Coming now from this general view to a more particular examination, we shall omit the three Samaritan Gnostics of the first century, Dositheus, Simon Magus and Menander, because they were not so properly Gnostic *corrupters* of Christianity, as absolute opposers of its claims, by their arrogant pretensions to be themselves mighty Æons or Messiahs, sent from God for the recovery of imprisoned souls. Concerning the early sect of the Nicolaitans, so little is known, that it cannot with certainty be affirmed whether they were Gnostics or not. First in order comes the Gnostic system of the Jew Cerinthus, very early in the second century, or, as some think, near the close of the first, and before the decease of the Apostle John. In this the Gnostic principles were not yet fully developed, but they were united with Jewish and Christian opinions.

Irenæus, Epiphanius and Theodoret have all described his tenets.† He believed in one God; and that the world was not made by him, but by Æons or angels. The God of

---

* Gieseler, I. 83.

† Lardner, Hist. Her. ch. 4, sec. 1.

the Jews was not the Supreme God, but an Æon ignorant of him. The Supreme God sent into the world one of the blessed Æons, whose name was Christ, and who descended in the shape of a dove upon the Jew Jesus, when he was baptized in Jordan. Christ through Jesus revealed the unknown God, and when, by the instigation of the world's creator, Jesus was crucified, Christ withdrew from him, so that Jesus only suffered. "He said that the kingdom of our Lord is terrestrial, or that he would reign on this earth, for he dreamed of eating and drinking and marriage and sacrifices and festivals to be accomplished at Jerusalem, and to last for a thousand years; for so long he thought the kingdom of the Lord would endure." It is said that the Evangelist John going to bathe, and seeing Cerinthus, said: "Let us flee hence, lest the bath should fall upon Cerinthus, and we share the same ruin."* This latter account is likewise given before Theodoret, by Irenæus.

Next to Cerinthus, in the reign of Adrian, and before all the other Gnostic heresiarchs, comes Saturninus of Antioch. In his system is distinctly developed the Asiatic Dualism, with the Supreme God on one side, and depraved matter on the other, subject to a lord, or evil principle, called Satan. The world and the first men were created without the knowledge of God, and in opposition to Satan, by seven angels; one of whom was the God of the Jews.† When this creation was completed, God imparted rational souls to the men; whereupon Satan opposed another sort of men of his own creating, to whom he imparted a malignant, but intellectual soul like his own. When the world's creators had revolted from the Supreme God, he sent down from heaven the blessed Æon Christ, clothed not with a real body, but with the shadow of one, that in our world he might destroy the kingdom of the lord of matter, and point out to good souls the way of returning back to God. Saturninus pretended to a very rigid moral discipline, regarding matter as inherently corrupt, the body as the seat of all vices, and marriage and generation as the devices of Satan.‡ The code of the Old Testament was rejected by him, on the ground of its having been compiled in part by the creators of the world, and in

* Lardner, VIII. 408.
† Gieseler, I. 88.
‡ Irenæus in Lardner, VIII. 348.

part by the prince of matter, or Satan.* Saturninus was probably an obscure person, with but few followers, and those confined to Syria.

Next were the Syrian Gnostics, Bardesanes and Tatian. The former was from Edessa, and flourished about the year 172; a man of great acumen, and distinguished for many learned productions. Following the oriental philosophy, he believed in a separate, independent author of all evil. The Supreme God created the world free from evil, and formed men with pure souls and ethereal bodies. The author of evil having seduced men to sin, God, in order to punish them, permitted him to corrupt the world, and to enclose men in gross bodies formed out of sinful matter. Hence the struggle between reason and concupiscence in man. Jesus, with an ethereal body, taught the way of deliverance from the bondage of matter, with the promise of reception into mansions of bliss.

Bardesanes gained many followers by his hymns, and was generally esteemed orthodox, although holding so many Gnostic errors. The Assyrian Tatian, his contemporary, was a distinguished and learned man, a pupil of Justin Martyr; after whose death he formed a sect of Gnostics in his own country, which was more distinguished by the rigid observance of an ascetic, self-denying life, than by its speculative Gnostic errors. He held that matter was the source of all evil, recommended the abhorrence and mortification of the body, denied to our Saviour a real body, and supposed that the creator of the world and the true God were not one and the same being.

Bardesanes and Tatian are both reckoned, by some learned writers, as followers of Valentinus. Buddæus confirms this opinion respecting Bardesanes by the authority of Jerome, who observes that he was at first a follower of Valentinus, but afterwards formed a separate heresy. That they were addicted to the Cabbalistic philosophy of the Hebrews, and drew their system from that fountain, he labors to prove.†

The most numerous, distinguished, and best known class of Gnostics, were the Alexandrian or Egyptian; concerning whom Mosheim is particularly lucid and full, both in his

* Mosh. Comm. II. 210.

† Buddæus de Heer. Valentin. § 18, (d.)

Commentaries and History. According to him, the Gnostics of the Egyptian class differed from the Asiatics by combining the oriental with the Egyptian philosophy, and especially in these particulars:* 1. "Although they supposed matter to be eternal, and also animated, they did not recognise an eternal prince of darkness and of matter, or the malignant deity of the Persians. 2. They generally considered our Saviour as consisting of two persons—the man Jesus, and the Son of God, or Christ; and the latter, the divine person, entered into the man Jesus when he was baptized by John, and parted from him when he was made a prisoner by the Jews. 3. They attributed to Christ a real and not an imaginary body, though they were not all of one sentiment on this point. 4. They prescribed to their followers a much milder system of moral discipline; nay, they seemed to give precepts which favored the corrupt propensities of men."

Among the Egyptian Gnostics the first place is commonly assigned to Basilides of Alexandria, who flourished about the year 125. Clement of Alexandria places him in the time of Adrian, and gives the story that he had been taught by Glaucias, a disciple of Peter.† He maintained that there emanated from the great First Cause (*θεὸς ἄρρητος*) seven most excellent Æons, (*νοῦς, λόγος, φρόνησις, σοφία, δύναμις, δικαιοσύνη, εἰρήνη,*) composing the first world of spirits.‡ Two of these Æons, Dunamis and Sophia, procreated the angels of the highest order, from whom there sprung successively three hundred and sixty-five other heavens; which are expressed by the mystic Egyptian word Abraxas, containing, when written in Greek, the letters that make up the number three hundred and sixty-five, and undoubtedly meant to designate, by a figure of speech, the highest Æon, or prince of the three hundred and sixty-five, styled Princeps Cælo-

---

* Mosh. Eccl. Hist. I. 175.

† Circa tempora Adriani imperatoris fuerunt, qui hæreses excogitarent, et pervenerent usque ad ætatem Antonini natu majoris, sicut Basilides, etiamsi Glauciam sibi adscribat magistrum, ut ipsi gloriantur, qui fuit Petri interpres. Clem. Stromata. 7.

‡ Irenæus, quoted at length in Lardner. Hist. Her. sec. 2. Also, Gieseler, I. 84.

rum. By the seven angels of the lowest heaven the world was made, out of the animated, malignant and disorderly mass of matter, under the superintendence of their chief, the God of the Jews. The Supreme God approved of the work when it was achieved; and benevolently added rational, spiritual souls to those men whom the angels had formed, with only concupiscent, brutal souls, derived from matter. When the world was thus supplied with rational souls of men, the angels, who formed it, apportioned its government and inhabitants among themselves, so that each nation might have its peculiar angelic ruler. Their chief made choice of the Jewish nation for himself, and gave them a law by his servant Moses.* In order to prevent the human souls that were thus allied to gross matter from sinking into a state of brutal insensibility, God sent them instructive legates and prophets. "Those that were attentive to the calls of these divine missionaries, on the dissolution of the material body were received to the regions of felicity; but those who rejected the proffered boon were constrained to migrate to other bodies, either of men or brutes, there to take up their residence until they should become qualified for reascending to their pristine, blissful abodes."†

Being a professed Christian, Basilides made it his study so to bend the principles and facts of the gospel, as to support these philosophic, or rather fantastic tenets. Accordingly he maintained that the cause of Christ's advent into the world, was the gradual defection of its founders and

* "When a distribution was afterwards made, the chief of the angels had the people of the Jews particularly to his share, a doctrine which, in the main, was received by many ancients; and is in part founded upon Deut. 32: 8; which, according to the version of the Seventy, is to this purpose: 'When the Most High divided the nations, and separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people, according to the number of the angels of God;' and this opinion they endeavored to support by Dan. 10: 13, 21, and 12: 1." Lardner on Basil. Hist. Her. sec. 5.

† Mosh. Comm. II. 233. Origin observes, that Basilides endeavored to deduce the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, from the words of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans: "I was alive without the law once." Lardner, Hist. Her. sec. 29.

governors from the Supreme God, their ambitious wars and strifes for dominion among themselves, and the consequent corruption, depravity and wretchedness of the whole human race. In compassion upon the souls of divine origin, God sent from heaven his Son—the first of the seven Æons—that, by joining himself to the man Jesus, he might restore the long lost knowledge of his Father, and overturn the empire of the angels who governed the world, and especially of the insolent Lord of the Jews. Enraged at this invasion of his dominion, the God of the Jews caused his subjects to seize the man Jesus and put him to death; but against the Æon Christ he had no power. When their bodies die, the souls of those that obey the precepts of Christ ascend to God, and the corrupt, vitiated matter of their bodies is never restored to life again; while the disobedient pass away into other bodies, until their impurities shall be wholly purged away.

It was one of the opinions of Basilides, that none but sinners suffer any evil in this life, and when the martyrs were adduced as suffering for the gospel, he answered that their pains were the punishment of sins committed either in this life, or in a pre-existent state.* When pressed with the argument of the sufferings of our Lord, he argued again, that as Jesus was a mere man, and as no man is free from sin, it were better to suppose Jesus a sinner, than allow God to be the cause of any evil: "I would say any thing rather than censure Providence." An accurate and impartial exhibition of his sentiments is given by Lardner,† drawn more especially from Clement of Alexandria, together with a close analysis from Beausobre's History of Manichæism. Basilides of course denied the resurrection, as all the Gnostics must do, who held the essential depravity of matter. Though strict in his morals, and recommending purity of life and the practice of piety to others, as is evident from the testi-

---

* Mosheim thinks that Basilides must have accounted for the association of divine souls with gross material bodies, only in this way; they had sinned in another state. He quotes Clemens Alex. Sed Basilidis hypothesis dicit animam, quæ prius peccaverat in alia vita, hic pati supplicium. Comm. II. 233, 234.

† Hist. Her. sec. 7, 8. Works, 8.

mony of Clement, his followers were guilty of the grossest excesses, which they sanctioned by the sophisms of their system. The maxim which they entertained, that God was not to be feared, but loved only, would, very naturally, deliver them to all kinds of licentiousness.* Basilides himself taught that it is lawful to conceal one's religion and deny Christ when life is in danger, and to participate in the pagan feasts, which followed their sacrifices. From this concession to depravity the same consequence would follow.

In regard to the mystic meaning of the word Abraxas, and the charge of magic and incantations brought against Basilides, the curious reader may consult the second volume of Mosheim's Commentaries, the Palæographia Græca of Montfaucon, and, if possible, Montfaucon's Antiquité Expliquée, with the full and cautious dissertation in Lardner. The use of this word by the Basilidians, and of the gems called Abraxæi as amulets or charms, came in part from the Jewish Cabbala, and in part from the paganism of the Egyptians; with the figures and names of whose deities upon those gems are mingled, in some instances, the names of God in the Hebrew Scriptures.† Nothing can exhibit more clearly the monstrous character of the superstitions, Oriental, Pagan and Jewish, that early corrupted Christianity, than the description of these gems. The name of Abraxas was probably used by the Egyptians as a talisman against evil demons.‡ Basilides was an Egyptian, and the adoption of their opinions and practices into his system was as natural and likely as any part of the combination of Oriental, Cabbalistic and Pagan philosophy and mythology. Many of the Christian fathers were believers in the efficacy of certain names to expel demons.§ The Jewish exorcists used the names of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and the Cabbalists the names of God in the Hebrew Scriptures. The name of Beelzebub, "the prince of the demons," would

---

* Il est bien vraisemblable, que c'est là ce qui fit attribuer aux Basilidieus, et aux autres Gnostiques, des mœurs impures et profanes. Que doit on penser de gens, qui font profession de ne point craindre Dieu? Beausobre's Hist. Manich. quoted in Lardner.

† Lardner, Hist. Her. s. 22. ‡ Mosheim Comm. II. 261.

§ Justin Martyr and Origen, quoted in Lardner, VIII. 368.

seem to have been in use, judging from the blasphemous charge of the Pharisees against our Lord.* After the casting out of devils in the name of Christ by his disciples became known, those magicians who had hitherto exorcised by other names, seem to have adopted his name, Jesus, which they saw to be so powerful. The seven sons of Sceva, the chief of the Jewish priests, did this. The expression "certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists," referred to a class, some of whom, it is not unlikely, continued their practices in the heretical sects of Christianity. The "doctrines of devils," reprobated by the Apostle, as marks of heretical sects that were to arise, together with the "profane and old wives' fables," the "fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions," as well as the "profane and vain babblings and oppositions of γνωσις, falsely so called," all characterized the Gnostic sects from the very first. The signs of "their conscience seared with hot iron," and of "forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats," were also visible, long before all these symptoms of the disease were converged, concentrated and consolidated into one vast system of corruption. As early as Saturninus, we have seen, marriage and generation were affirmed to be of Satan, and abstinence from animal food was enjoined.

Still more ingenious, diffuse, imaginative and fabulous was the system of Valentinus, who went from Alexandria to Rome about the year 140, and was there expelled from the bosom of the church as an incorrigible heretic. He perfected his system in the island of Cyprus, and there died about the year 160. He surpassed all his fellow heresiarchs in fecundity of genius, and in the multitude of his followers, his doctrines passing with astonishing celerity through Asia, Africa and Europe. Without entering minutely into his complicated and curious fables, it is enough to say, that he supposed thirty alternately male and female Æons to have emanated from the abyss (buthos) of Deity, who constituted the pleroma.† Besides these, there were four others of pre-eminent greatness, Horus, the guar-

* Matt. 12: 24.

† The expression of Paul, In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, may have had respect to this monstrous

dian of the confines of the pleroma, Christ, the Holy Spirit and Jesus. From the passionate struggles of the last of the Æons—Sophia—to comprehend and unite herself with the original, uncreated Source of all, there sprang an imperfect being, called Achamoth, (the sciences or philosophy,) who, wandering in chaos without the pleroma, at length imparted life to matter, and formed the Demiurgus, by whom the world was made of the sensitive substance, (Psychie,) and the material, (Hylie,) to which also, in the formation of men, Achamoth added the spiritual (or Pneumatic.)* "In process of time the Demiurgus forgot his createdness, and, by his prophets sent among the Jews, pretended to be the Supreme God, and subjected men to his grievous tyranny, and obliterated the knowledge of the true God. To rescue man from this deplorable state, the Deity sent Christ from the 'pleroma of his glory,' who passed uncontaminated through the body of Mary, as water through a conduit. Had he received the minutest particle from the body of Mary, it might, like leaven, have corrupted the whole mass, and generated in the sensitive soul, a propensity inimical to reason.† At his baptism, Jesus, another of the highest Æons, joined himself to him in the form of a dove." The enraged Demiurgus caused him to be seized and crucified. But before his death the Æons, Christ and Jesus, forsook him and fled back to the pleroma; so that only his material (Hylie) body, and sensitive (Psychie) soul were suspended on the cross.

Those who, according to the precepts of Christ, renounce the worship not only of the pagan deities, but likewise of the Jewish God, and submit to have their sentient and concupiscent soul chastised and reformed by reason, shall with both their souls, the rational and the sentient, be admitted to the mansions of the blessed near to the pleroma. And when all

---

fancy of the genealogy of the Æons. But the Valentinians, it would seem, resorted to that Scripture for confirmation of their scheme. Namque quod (Coloss. 2: 9) dicitur, in Christo habitasse totam plenitudinem Deitatis, id more suo explicabant omnium æonum perfectiones in eam collatas esse, et sic porro. Buddæus, 6, (i.)

* Mosh. Comm. 266—300.—Buddæus de Hœres. Valent. sec. 6.—Gieseler, I. 86.

† Mosh. Comm. II. 290, 292.

the particles of the divine nature, or all souls, shall be separated from matter and purified, a raging fire shall spread through this material universe, and destroy the whole fabric of nature, by which all things shall be consummated, and the 'harmony of the universe restored.'

Nearly allied, in many respects, to the Valentinians, was the sect of the Orphites or Serpentians, whose leader was Euphrates, and which Mosheim thinks to have originated among the Jews, even before the Christian era. They were divided into various sects, of which one supposed the serpent that deceived our first parents to have been Sophia, or Christ himself, concealed under the serpent's form. This opinion induced them to keep some sacred serpents, and to pay them a species of honor, from which has originated their name. Into such absurdities, remarks Mosheim, men might easily fall, who believed the creator of the world to be a different being from the Supreme God, and regarded as divine whatever was opposed to the pleasure of Demiurgus. Notwithstanding its absurdity, of all the strictly Gnostic sects, this is said to have lasted the longest, Justinian having enacted laws against them so late as the year 530.*

Worst of all the Gnostics was Carpocrates of Alexandria, who lived in the reign of Adrian. In the general principles of his philosophy he did not differ from the other Egyptian Gnostics. But he maintained that Jesus was born of the Virgin Mary in the ordinary course of nature, and that he was superior to other men in nothing but fortitude and greatness of soul. "Like Pythagoras, Plato and Aristotle, he had shown by his example how the Gnostic was to free himself from the Demiurge, and unite with the Supreme God, (Monas.) His followers kept in their sanctuaries the portraits of those Grecian philosophers, together with that of Jesus." The Carpocratians openly professed the most horrible immoralities; and, if not utterly misrepresented, they must have swept away the foundations of virtue, and given to the corrupt heart license to all iniquity.

The last of the strictly Gnostic families of the second century which we shall notice, is that of Asia Minor, or the

* For a full account of the Orphites, see Neander. Kirchen. I. 746—756.

school of Marcion. He studied at Rome between 140 and 150; and failing to obtain an office in the church, to which he aspired, and having been twice excommunicated, became a follower of the Syrian Gnostic Cordo, and with him originated a powerful party, called Marcionites; which, notwithstanding every effort to subdue them, existed as late as the sixth century. Starting with the oriental, Syriac and Persian notion, that there are two first causes of things—the one perfectly good, and the other perfectly evil—they ranked the architect of this world, or the God of the Jews, who is neither perfectly good nor perfectly evil, between these two deities. According to Origen, they held that the good principle governs the Christians, the creating principle the Jews, and the evil principle the heathen.* The evil deity and the creating deity were perpetually at war; each seeking to subject the inhabitants of the whole world to himself. To put an end to this war, and deliver the souls of mankind, the Supreme God sent his Son Jesus Christ, in the appearance of a body, "dissolving," as Irenæus says, "the law and the prophets, and all the works of him that made the world."† He was assailed both by the evil deity, and the creating deity, at whose instigation he was betrayed by the Jews and crucified; but as Marcion did not believe that our Lord was born at all, or had any thing but the appearance of a man, the crucifixion must have been only in appearance. Those who subdue and mortify their bodies, and, renouncing the evil deity and the God of the Jews, cleave to the Supreme God, shall, after death, ascend to the celestial mansions.‡

The Marcionites denied the resurrection of the body, and, according to Epiphanius, believed in the transmigration of souls.§ They believed there were to be two Christs, the Christ promised by the prophets of the Creator being yet to come. Their moral discipline, as prescribed, was austere and rigorous, and their manners virtuous. They condemned marriage, wine, flesh, and whatever is grateful and pleasant to the body. They fasted on the Jewish Sabbath,

* Dial. contr. Marcion, quoted in Lardner, Hist. Her. § 9.
† Irenæus in Lardner, VIII. 448.
‡ Mosh. Comm. II. 318–332.—Eccl. Hist. I. 173.
§ Lardner, VIII. 469.

to show their contempt for the God of the Jews, and, according to Clement, became martyrs out of hatred to him, and abstained from marriage that they might not people his world.* They rejected the Old Testament, as proceeding from the Creator, mutilated the New Testament, wherever it contained quotations from the Old, and asserted that Christ came to destroy the law given by the God of the Jews, because it was opposite to the gospel. Of the gospels, Marcion received only one, that of Luke, mutilated, altered, and interpolated at pleasure. He had a great number of followers, some of whom established new sects.

A review of the tenets of the Gnostics confirms us in two opinions. First, as to their origin, it is to be traced to the admixture of no one system of philosophy then prevalent on the earth with Christianity, but to a vicious combination of materials from them all. The Dualism of the East is uppermost; and the doctrine of the inherent, inseparable depravity of matter, as the source of evil and of sin, constitutes the essence of Gnosticism. But in its various phases, we see things that may have come from Plato, and even Aristotle, as well as Zoroaster; from Greece, Egypt and Judea, as well as Persia and Babylon. The doctrine of the transmigration of souls may have been the progeny, for the Gnostic sects, either of the Egyptian mythology, or of the Pythagorean philosophy. The Greeks and the Egyptians might have been the parents of all the fantastic and monstrous chimeras of the Gnostic mind, without any acquaintance with what Mr. Taylor, in his admirable work on ancient Christianity, denominates "that awful mistress of the ancient world, the ORIENTAL THEOSOPHY."

Secondly, as to the traces of the Gnostics to be found in the New Testament, we are convinced that Paul has them in view more than once; that, while it is not to be supposed that separate societies were already formed, the opinions, or distorted phantasmas of opinion, growing out of the mixture of Christianity with the heathen philosophy, which led to such societies, were already intruded upon the church. It makes but little difference whether, at that early period, we call the stream of corrupting philosophy, Heathen, Jewish, or Gnostic; the latter is the term which soon began to

* Clement and Epiphanius in Lardner, VII. 482.

distinguish the various compounds of error, Pagan or Cabbalistic, with the truths of religion revealed by Christ, and preached by the apostles.

The learned Buddæus declares his conviction that the whole system of the Valentinian heresy flowed from the Jewish Cabbala, that corrupted fountain of subtle speculations concerning divine things.* In the time of the apostles it consisted in a system of oral traditions, which the Jews affected to have received by divine inspiration. Its succession of philosophical legends, representing all things as descending in a continued scale from the first Light, the Deity and Creator,† were a fit parentage for the Gnostic doctrines of the generations of Æons. By an elaborate comparison of the Valentinian system with the Jewish Cabbala, Buddæus proves the closest resemblance between the two in twenty definite particulars. *Gnosticorum recte et Valentinianorum, ex eodum fonte derivandæ fuerint hæreses.* A more perfect description of the Cabbalistic Hebrew philosophy received by the Gnostics, especially by the Valentinians, could not be given than that by Paul, 1 Tim. 1: 4, "fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions rather than godly edifying, which is in faith;" also Col. 2: 8, "philosophy and vain deceit, the traditions of men and the elements of the world." In Col. 2: 18, 19, "intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and not holding the Head," we have a graphic delineation of almost any one of the leaders of the Gnostic sects. We have already referred to the opinion of Vitringa. "I see not," he observes, "to what these expressions of the apostle can properly be referred, if not to those subtle disputations concerning the Divinity and its various emanations, with which certain Jews, followers of the Platonic or Pythagorean schools of philosophy, were much occupied."‡ And

---

* Mihi certum et exploratum est, totum illud Valentinianæ doctrinæ systema, ex Kabbala Judæorum, tum jam corrupta, et in subtilissimas speculationes de rebus divinis abeunte, profluxisse: idque vel ex eo luculenter patet, quod eadem Kabbalistarum sint placita, quæ proposuerunt ac defenderunt Valentiniani. Buddæus, Diss. de Hæresi Val. § 15.

† Tennemann, Hist. Phil. § 198.

‡ Quin ubi Paulus in Epistola ad Timotheum priore hunc

again, in a learned dissertation concerning the Sephiroth of the Cabbalists, he avows his firm persuasion, that where Paul admonishes Timothy to guard against Jewish fables and interminable genealogies, the word *γενεαλογίας* means the same thing with the apostle, as the word *Sephirarum* with the Cabbalists; referring to the same absurd system of generations of the Divine attributes, ÆONES with the Gnostics, SEPHIROTH with the Cabbalists.*

The subject of the moral influence of Gnosticism, with its long continued and disastrous reign, whether acknowledged or opposed, within the pale of ancient Christianity, will form an interesting field of future investigation. It will be necessary, in connection, to present a brief view of the Manichean form of Gnosticism of the third and fourth centuries.

---

charissimum discipulum suum dehortatur ab *ἀντιθέσεσι τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως*, oppositis parallelismis scientiæ falso sic dictæ, et a fabulis et *γενεαλογίαις ἀπεράντοις*, recensionibus infinitis: non video quo illud commodius referri queat, quam ad subtilissimas disputationes *de Divinitate*, ejusque variis *Emanationibus*, (Kabbalistæ ספירות dicunt:) quibus se Judæi aliqui, Platonicæ aut Pythagoricæ Philosophiæ studiosi, occupatos habebant, et in quibus arcanæ et sublimioris scientiæ, maximam constituebant partem. Quomodo jam olim Irenæus et Tertullianus Pauli mentem acceperunt, et mihi recte accepisse videntur. Vitringa, Obs. Sac. II. 150.

* Vitringa, Dis. de Seph. Kab. L. I. c. 2.

ARTICLE VII.

An Essay on the Power of the Will over the other Faculties.

By the Author of "An Essay on Cause and Effect," etc. Vol. II., p. 381.

In an "Essay on Cause and Effect," in the Repository for October, 1839, the writer* of the present article endeavored to establish the position, that the doctrine of free agency primarily consists in maintaining, that mind is constituted with power to choose otherwise than as it does choose. In other words, a free agent is a mind possessing *susceptibilities* of pain and pleasure, *intellect*, which enables it to judge what will secure *the most* enjoyment, and *will*, or the power of deciding *which kind* of enjoyment shall be secured;—it is not, like matter, bound, by its nature to one and only one fixed rule of change, but is endowed with inherent powers of activity, so that *motives* are not producing, but only occasional causes of volition.

* The "Essay" of this writer in the Repository for October, 1839, for peculiar reasons, as then stated, was allowed to appear anonymously. Much curiosity was manifested to know its authorship, and the editor, as well as the writer, has to regret that the name, through the neglect of some one, has become known to a few of our readers. As the reasons for withholding it are quite peculiar, and such as would be regarded altogether creditable to the writer, it is hoped that no unnecessary publication of it will be made by those to whom it may have been communicated.

Our constant readers are aware that the former "Essay" by this author has called forth two articles from the Rev. Dr. Woods, in the January and July Nos. of the Repository, and an article by an anonymous "Inquirer," in the April No., on the same general subject. The points in discussion, in these able hands, we think have already received some interesting and profitable elucidation. Dr. Woods, however, has something more to say in reply to the questions propounded to him by "Inquirer," and the writer of the present article will claim the right of replying to the strictures of Dr. Woods on the Essay of October, 1839. Indeed a reply to the first article of Dr. Woods was furnished by the author of the "Essay," in

The question of free agency relates simply to the *powers* conferred on mind by the Creator. The fatalist claims that it is so constituted that it can choose only one thing, viz. that which it does choose. The advocate of free agency claims that it has power to choose either of two or more modes of enjoyment, and that in all cases of volition it had power to have chosen otherwise.

In maintaining the doctrine of free agency, the writer stated the opposite doctrine of fate, and showed that its whole defence was based, either on the assumption that desire and volition are the same thing, or else on a species of sophistry which seems to unite the character of the *petitio principii*, and also of *reasoning in a circle*. The writer then attempted to establish the doctrine of free agency, by showing that it is one of those intuitive truths, or first principles of reason, which all men believe, and which they prove to be their belief by their feelings, words and actions.

It is now proposed to inquire concerning the other constitutional powers of mind, and how far they can be modified or controlled by the will. And in doing this, there will be no need of abstruse and metaphysical subtilties or technics. The language of common life furnishes all the distinctions and the terms which will be required.

The question then in popular language is this, How far are our thoughts and feelings under the control of our will?

It appears that the mind is susceptible of pain and pleasure from a great variety of sources. There are the enjoyments of the senses, the pleasures of taste, the enjoyment connected with the simple exercise of our physical and mental powers, the enjoyment of the affections, and the pleasures incident to our moral nature. All these suscepti-

---

season for our July No. But we shall be excused for deferring its publication, to afford the writer opportunity to say, in a single article hereafter, all that may be judged necessary in answer to the two articles by Dr. Woods. We are happy to add that the spirit of these discussions, thus far, has been such as we desire ever to see exhibited on the pages of the Repository. We trust, also, that the writers will, in the end, be able fully to understand each other, and that some points of truth, which have long been the subject of controversy, will have been so explained and defended as to command the settled belief of our intelligent readers.—Editors.

bilities render us liable to suffer from the same sources. This, of course, is an incomplete enumeration of the mental susceptibilities. All acts of volition relate to the attainment of some one or other of these kinds of enjoyment, or the avoidance of suffering from some of these sources. No act of volition can be named, that does not imply a desire to escape some evil or gain some good, of which these susceptibilities make us capable.

Minds seem to be differently endowed in reference to the relative proportion of these susceptibilities, as to vividness and strength. Whether this is owing to the original constitution of mind, or to differing influences and circumstances in the early period of existence, is a question of little practical moment, and one not easily determined. But the fact of such a difference none can dispute. That some are much more susceptible to emotions of shame, or fear, or anger, that some are susceptible to higher enjoyment from the possession of power, or distinction or affection than others, none will deny. A *rational* mind is one which has the power of comparing different modes of enjoyment, of ascertaining their relative tendencies through a long period of time, and of deciding which will secure *the most* enjoyment with the least suffering; and a mind is said to act rationally, just in proportion as its choices lead to the attainment of the highest amount of good, with the least consequent evil.

In regard to volitions, there is the foundation for a distinction which may be denominated *generic* and *specific*. Generic volitions are those on which subsequent volitions depend, and specific volitions are those which are consequent on some previous volition. For example, a man wills to sketch a landscape from nature. In consequence of this volition, a thousand specific volitions follow. Every step taken, every movement of the pencil in executing this determination, is caused by volitions which are consequent on a generic previous volition. Volitions may be generic in regard to certain volitions and specific in reference to others. Thus the determination to sketch a landscape, though generic in reference to consequent volitions, may be specific in reference to a more generic volition, which was made when the man chose the profession of a painter.

There are some volitions so extensive in their consequences as to exert a controlling influence over almost all

the volitions of the whole future life. Thus when a man chooses to become a lawyer, rather than a merchant or a physician, by one act of choice he renders almost every volition of his future life different from what it would have been, had this generic volition been otherwise.

We are now prepared to inquire respecting the influence of our volitions on our thoughts and feelings, or in more scientific terms, on our intellectual powers and our susceptibilities.

The laws of association, as they are called, are those facts in regard to the succession of our thoughts, which have been ascertained by experience. One of the most important of these is the influence of strong desire, or other strong emotions in making vivid our perceptions and conceptions. For example, in regard to perceptions, let persons be sitting in a parlor in the evening without any anxiety respecting matters without, and the sound of passing wheels is not vivid or distinct. But let the mind be in a state of great fear or anxiety, awaiting the return of a messenger, and even the distant sound of wheels will be clear and vivid. So of our conceptions: let the mind be in a state of indifference when an event takes place, the after conception of this event will be vague and indistinct;—as for example, when we meet a person in whom we feel no interest, the idea of his countenance afterwards will be vague and imperfect. But let us meet the admired and venerated deliverer of a nation, and the lineaments of his face, which were seen when the mind was excited with emotion, return almost with the vividness of perception.

Another important principle of association is this, that those ideas which have been united when the mind is under the influence of strong desire, or of other strong emotions, usually return in the same association. For example, let a messenger bring mournful or joyful tidings to us, and afterwards the sight of his face will recall the tidings. Or let our feelings of enthusiasm and affection be excited toward any object, and whatever has been in any way associated with it, will recall this beloved object to the mind.

These illustrations enable us to detect and describe the mental process involved in the succession of our thoughts, and show that, in a very great degree, it must depend upon our present interests and plans. These decide what ideas shall become most vivid and distinct, while our past interests and emotions decide what ideas shall return by association.

The mind ordinarily has some object of interest which it is pursuing—some wish is to be gratified—some cause to be searched out—some good to be gained. A mental picture arises before the mind composed of various objects. Among these associated objects, those which are most consonant with the leading desires of the mind become vivid and distinct, and the others fade away. Then by the law of association these prominent objects soon gather around them the various associates with which they have been connected at times when the mind was excited by desire or emotion, and thus a new picture is formed. In this new combination the mind again fastens on those objects which are in agreement with the chief interest of the mind, and these stand out from the rest with fresh vividness, and gather around them past associates to form another picture. And thus the mental process is carried on, until outward objects affect the senses and change this process of mental action. But objects that affect the senses have all been associated with other objects, at periods when the mind was excited by desire and emotion, and so these associated ideas are recalled even by outward objects.—Thus it is clear that the nature and succession of our thoughts are very greatly determined by the nature of our plans, purposes and desires.

There is one other very important fact in our mental history. When the mind, in a state of indecision, contemplates two incompatible modes of enjoyment, it feels a desire for both, but after duly considering which will be best on the whole, it makes its election; and after this decision, the desire for the thing which is relinquished usually diminishes. For example, if a man decides that a certain kind of food is injurious, the firm determination not to touch it usually lessens the desire for it. The mind is seldom excited by any strong desire for a thing which it is certain can never be attained. If it were discovered that we could all visit the moon by an easy and safe method, it is probable that multitudes would be agitated by a strong desire to go, but how seldom and how faint are the desires now felt for such a journey! So men will be agitated by the strongest desire for wealth and honor within their reach, but how few are stimulated by such fervent desires to be a king or queen! Desire then is dependent in some degree on the hope of attainment. Whenever therefore the mind has decided not

to attempt to gain a given enjoyment, then hope ceases, and desire is consequently diminished,—while the object chosen usually increases in interest and importance the longer it is pursued. How often do we find it the case, that a man enters upon some enterprise with very little interest, and pursues it with increasing enthusiasm, till every thing else seems to be absorbed by this engrossing object!

We are now prepared to trace the influence which generic volitions exert upon our perceptions, conceptions, desires, emotions, tastes and pursuits. To do this in a less abstract form, let us suppose a young man to be placed in a situation where he must decide for himself whether he will be a soldier or a farmer. His youthful friend urges him to unite with him in the military profession—his father urges him to remain at home, and seek wealth and station in his native village, by the cultivation of his patrimony. It may be he balances long, but at length he decides to become a soldier. Immediately his thoughts and feelings begin to run in a new channel. His mind is immediately ranging in its conceptions, through the course of his journey, to the scenes and pursuits of the military school, thence to the camp and battle-field. Soon his tastes are changed. His interest in all subjects connected with the cultivation of his patrimony diminishes, he acquires a love for mathematics, a taste for drawing—a passion for military music. His desires, hopes, fears and anxieties are all changed. One single act of volition, which was quick as the lightning flash, decided what would be the nature of millions of consequent volitions, and of all the desires, emotions, tastes and pursuits connected with them.

To show more minutely how this generic volition would influence future states of mind, let us suppose this young soldier to have commenced his military career. He enters a large city; and what are the objects that most vividly affect his senses? They are the arsenal, the waving flag of his country, the fort, the military articles in the shops, the military characters and battle scenes displayed at the windows. He enters some public assembly and finds a young orator declaiming in favor of agricultural pursuits, and drawing a disparaging contrast between the benevolent agencies of the farmer and the baleful career of the soldier. The young soldier is instantly excited by a strong desire to de-

fend his profession. Instantly his mind is filled with associated thoughts, and, from this medley, all those points that seem fitted to convince himself or others of the benefits of his profession, stand out in vivid distinctness, while others, not in consonance with his leading desire, fade away, and thus the whole process of reasoning will be varied by the deep interest he feels.

And so in regard to his emotions. Suppose the mail to arrive—what is it that awakens anxiety, that flushes his cheek with hope as he goes? What makes his eye sparkle with joy as he reads? It is not the rise of stocks, not the prospect of a high market price. It is some change in military arrangements, that will advance him in his pursuit of military fame. How different would have been his thoughts his tastes, his reasonings, his hopes, his fears, his joys, if this young man had chosen the agricultural profession instead of the military! This may serve to illustrate the influence of generic volitions on other mental operations.

There is another fact in the history of mind which few will deny. It is, that one particular mode of gratification may become the chief object of interest and pursuit, so that in common parlance it is called the ruling passion. When the mind is under the control of a ruling passion, although all other modes of enjoyment may be sought, to a greater or less extent, yet when they are found to conflict with this chief end, they are inevitably denied. Thus it has been known that the desire of revenge has overcome every other desire, and has been pursued with implacable pertinacity, by day and by night, at the sacrifice of every other enjoyment, till it was satiated.

Thus the passion of love, in certain cases, has been the mainspring of action to a mind, and every other good has been sacrificed when in competition with this master passion. In other cases ambition has been the ruling principle to which every other good was regarded as secondary. It is manifest that a mind which is under the control of such a ruling principle, has all its susceptibilities and all its intellectual operations regulated by it. While such a principle exists, it is as impossible to change the thoughts, emotions and desires by any specific acts of volition to do so, as it is to turn the current of a river by a straw.

The question now arises; Has mind the power to regulate

this matter—can it decide whether to have a ruling passion, and what this passion shall be? Here is the chief battle-ground for free agency

There are but three things that can be conceived of as deciding what shall be the ruling passion. The first is the *constitutional organizat on* of the mind, whereby it is made so susceptible to one species of enjoyment as invariably to prefer it to all others; second, the *circumstances* in which men are placed, so that having only certain modes of enjoyment in their reach, they are restricted to particular enjoyments, and in selecting from these, the decision turns on constitutional susceptibilities. The third supposition is, that man himself has, by the power of volition, the control of his desires and pursuits, so that, though constitution and circumstances have an influence in deciding his course, he himself has the controlling power. Thus, whatever may be his constitutional susceptibilities, or whatever circumstances of temptation may surround him, he always has the power of deciding which mode of enjoyment shall be sought in preference to all others.

The fatalist maintains that a man's destiny is decided *entirely* and *only* by his constitution and his circumstances, both of which God determines. The defender of free agency brings in God and man as co-workers in deciding man's destiny. God decides what shall be the constitutional susceptibilities and their relative proportions, and his agency regulates the circumstances of temptation. But man also can, to a great degree, control circumstances; he can by his volitions decide many of his future circumstances, while at the same time he can, to a certain extent, modify his susceptibilities. And at all times he can choose or refuse any kind of good that is put within his reach. God always has the power to *prevent* any given volition by a change of circumstance, man is able to prevent any given volition by the power of free agency. Thus nothing that depends on man's volitions can take place contrary to God's will, and yet man always retains the power of taking or refusing any mode of enjoyment within his reach. Man never can say that he could not have chosen otherwise.

It is therefore maintained that every human mind has the power of selecting some one mode of enjoyment, as the chief end, to which all others shall be subordinate; and that

afterwards he has also the power to give up one ruling passion, and originate another.

An example which illustrates both these positions is given by Foster, in his essay on Decision of Character. He describes the case of a young man of fortune, who was a spendthrift. The chief end of his life was to secure those sensual gratifications that money can purchase. The pleasures of sense were his chief end, and money was of no value but as a means to this end. He wasted his estate and became a beggar. One day, standing on an eminence overlooking his patrimony, he suddenly formed the determination that he would recover it. He started off immediately, and began to do the most menial services for hire. He saved every penny, and denied himself like an anchorite—did and thought of nothing but how to make money through a long life, and died an inveterate miser, worth sixty thousand pounds.

The writer might describe, from personal observation, some instances very similar to the above; but this may suffice to illustrate the idea. In the case of this miser, he had no previous constitutional propensities, no habits, no principles to lead to that character, nor were there any other circumstances, to urge to diligence and economy, than had existed some time before the moment of his decision. The whole character of his interests, feelings, plans and pursuits were reversed by a single act of volition, and this act he had the power to withhold or to reverse.

Among other susceptibilities common to all minds, is that which may be called *involuntary* or *instinctive benevolence.* Every mind, to a greater or less extent, feels a pleasure in conferring enjoyment on others. Some have this principle very strong, some are very deficient; but even among young children, we find their parents characterizing some as generous and benevolent *by nature*, and others as naturally very selfish. This natural susceptibility has nothing of a moral nature, and, unrestrained by reason, may lead to as much evil as the unregulated indulgence of any natural propensity.

The writer has been acquainted with a person whose career through life exhibits the evils of the unregulated indulgence of this susceptibility. When he entered the active scenes of life, he seemed to become the victim of his kind

feelings. He was ready to oblige every body, and knew not how to refuse a request. Every person in his sphere, who wanted money, time or service, went to him for help, and thus, without system, and without any regulating principle, though ever intent on kindness, he in fact did about as much evil as good. He could not govern his children, because his impulses led him to gratify all their wishes. He was so absorbed by the business of others as to neglect his own family. He was constantly imposed upon, had no heart to collect his debts, and was so lavish in bestowing money, that, in the end, he ruined himself and injured the interests of the friends who tried to serve him. His children grew up with vicious habits, and all his comforts seemed to flee, while the world looked on and wondered why so kind, so benevolent, so amiable a man should be reduced to such straits.

It is necessary to make a distinction between what may be called *instinctive benevolence*, of which the above is an example, and that which may be called *voluntary* or *rational benevolence*, whereby the mind of man, having the power of judging of *general tendencies*, and of calculating results through a long course of action, is enabled to act so as to secure *the most* happiness on the whole, both individual and general. Rational benevolence calmly decides which will produce the *highest* measure of enjoyment, and, when consistent, never sacrifices a greater for a lesser good.

We are now prepared to illustrate the position, that a man may choose, as the main purpose of life, *to produce happiness*, according to the rules of rational benevolence, so that the gratification of this desire shall become the ruling passion. There is no example that will more fully illustrate this position than that of the illustrious Howard.

There is no more accurate description of a master passion than is furnished by the classical Foster in describing the career of Howard. Speaking of the energy of his determination in the pursuit of his benevolent plans, Foster says, "it was so great, that if, instead of being habitual, it had been shown only for a short time, or on particular occasions, it would have appeared a vehement impetuosity. But, by being unintermitted, it had an equability of manner which scarcely appeared to exceed the tone of a calm constancy, it was so totally the reverse of any thing like turbulence or

agitation. It was the calmness of an intensity kept uniform by the nature of the human mind forbidding it to be more, and by the character of the individual forbidding it to be less. The habitual passion of his mind was a measure of feeling almost equal to the temporary extremes and paroxysms of common minds; as a great river, in its customary state, is equal to a small or moderate one, when swollen by a torrent. The moment of finishing his plans in deliberation, and commencing them in action was the same. I wonder what must have been the amount of that bribe in emolument or pleasure, that would have detained him a week inactive, after their final adjustment. The law which carries water down a declivity was not more unconquerable and invariable, than the determination of his feelings towards the main object. The importance of this object held his faculties in a state of excitement which was too rigid to be affected by higher interests, and on which, therefore, the beauties of nature or of art had no power. He had no leisure feeling which he could spare to be diverted among the innumerable varieties, of the extensive scene which he traversed; all his subordinate feelings lost their separate existence and operation by falling into the grand one."

"There have not been wanting trivial minds to mark this as a fault in his character. But the *mere* man of taste ought to be silent respecting such a man as Howard; he is above his sphere of judgment. The invisible spirits who fulfil their commissions of philanthropy among mortals, do not care about pictures, statues and sumptuous buildings; and no more did he, when the time in which he must have inspected and admired them, would have been taken from the work to which he had consecrated his life. The curiosity he might feel was reduced to wait till the hour should arrive, when its gratification should be sanctioned by conscience, which kept a scrupulous charge of all his time. If, at every hour when it came, he was fated to feel the attractions of the fine arts but as the *second* claim, they might be sure of their revenge; for no other man will ever visit Rome under such a despotic consciousness of duty, as to refuse himself time for surveying the magnificence of its ruins. Such a sin against taste is very far beyond the reach of common saintship to commit. It implied an inconceivable severity of conviction that he had *one thing to do*, and that he who would do some

great thing in this short life, must apply himself to the work with such a concentration of his forces, as, to idle spectators, who live only to amuse themselves, looks like insanity." To this general outline it may be well to add some more definite particulars. His writings contain these maxims, which he seemed to have placed as the way-marks of his course:

"Let this maxim be the leading feature in my life, constantly to favor and relieve *those that are lowest*."—"Our superfluities should be given up for the convenience of others."—"Our conveniences should give way to the necessities of others."—"Our necessities should give way to the extremities of others." What a perfect chart are the above maxims of the way in which *rational benevolence* will lead, in securing the *highest* amount of general happiness!

In pursuance of this plan, he devoted his life to relieving the miseries of "those that were lowest;" he went to the deepest abodes of guilt and misery, to listen, day after day and year after year, to "the sorrowful sighing of those who had no helper," and to pour the oil of consolation into their wounds. In prosecuting this enterprise, he travelled nearly sixty thousand miles at his own charges, at an expense of more than one hundred and thirty thousand dollars. He often travelled several days and nights successively, over roads almost impassable, in the most inclement weather, and with the most miserable accommodations. He adopted the most abstemious and simple diet, that he might be able to find his wants supplied wherever suffering men could be found. To make him safer against the sudden damp of dungeons, and to harden his constitution, he accustomed himself to lie in damp sheets, and he confined himself to only six hours of sleep, that every possible hour might be saved for his great end. And he was of so sympathizing a spirit that his friend Dr. Aikin remarks, "I have seen the tear of sensibility start into his eyes, recalling some of the distressful scenes to which he had been witness, and the spirit of indignation flash from them on relating instances of baseness and oppression." So decided and systematic was he in the grand pursuit of his life, that often in conversation, he sat with his watch in his hand resting on his knee, and when the appointed moment arrived, nothing could tempt him to delay.

These particulars may suffice as an illustration of the position, that rational benevolence may become the ruling passion of the human mind.

The case of Howard serves also to illustrate the fact, that when rational benevolence becomes the leading object, the mind is gradually more and more absorbed in it. It appears that Howard was a private gentleman of fortune, who at first directed his benevolent efforts simply to the happiness of his own family and his immediate dependents. Gradually the field of his vision and enterprise was enlarged, and when he was appointed to the office of high sheriff, he first began to interest himself in behalf of the tenants of prisons. Very soon his interest augmented, till he extended his inquiries still further than his own immediate district. Then he began to make tours of inquiry through England, Scotland and Ireland, and finally the whole of Europe became the theatre of his expansive benevolence. When the death of his wife, and the departure of his only child to school made his home solitary, then his whole time, and talents, and energies were absorbed by his great work.

We may now inquire as to the effect produced on the mind, when rational benevolence becomes the ruling passion. It is manifest that a mind may be under this governing principle, and yet there may be differences in degrees of intensity. In the beginning of Howard's career it is manifest that the principle was not nearly so strong or absorbing as at the close.

Let us now suppose a human mind to have gained such a high state of benevolent feeling, that every species of personal gratification is as nothing, when in competition with the claims of benevolence. It is manifest that the whole train of thought would be almost entirely in connexion with benevolent enterprise—the conceptions, the perceptions, the tastes, the reasoning powers, and the habits of action would all be regulated by the benevolent principle.

But there are certain ingredients in human character which present an interesting subject of inquiry in this connexion. There are emotions, called by some the vindictive, and by others the malevolent affections, concerning which there is a diversity of opinion, as to their character. It is certain that every mind is so constituted by the Creator, that the infliction of needless and wanton evil on ourselves or on

others, awakens indignation and a desire of retribution. How would this part of our mental constitution be affected were rational benevolence the ruling principle? The supposition implies that whenever any other desire is seen to conflict with this ruling passion, it is inevitably resisted. By the supposition then, the desire of retribution would never be gratified, except in those cases where it would tend to increase the general happiness. In all other cases it would be subdued by the benevolent principle.

There are other principles found in the human mind, such as selfishness, ambition, pride, envy and revenge. Could these exist in a mind under the entire control of rational benevolence? An investigation of their nature will decide the question. *Selfishness* is a state of mind consequent on the want of a dominant principle of rational benevolence, and it is exhibited by the constant preference of our own inferior good to the greater good of others. Of course its co-existence with rational benevolence, as the ruling passion, is impossible. *Pride* is a state of mind consequent on selfishness, and consists in a disproportionate estimate of our own interests and importance. It is pained at seeing others above us—it is indifferent to the feelings of those below us. Of course, it could not exist in a mind so benevolent as to rejoice in happiness wherever it is enjoyed. *Envy*, also, is an emotion consequent on selfishness. It is the feeling of pain, which arises at seeing others enjoy that of which we are deprived. This emotion, therefore, would be banished by a master principle of benevolence.

From the preceding analysis we are prepared to fix the limits of that control which mind has over its various susceptibilities. In certain cases volition has no influence to prevent or remove certain desires and emotions. For example, if the earth should suddenly cleave asunder, and threaten instant death, no volition could prevent or remove the emotion of fear. So, in cases of extreme hunger or thirst, the sight of food and drink would inevitably awaken desires which no volitions could prevent. So, also, when any object of enjoyment becomes a ruling passion, no subordinate volitions can prevent emotions of desire, fear, hope, or joy, as events or circumstances appear, that tend to advance or retard the leading object of interest. If, for example, a man has set out to gain a certain point of political

elevation, and is bending all his energies to accomplish this object, no other volition could prevent his thoughts from running on this subject more than on any other. No subordinate volition could prevent hope, desire, or anxiety respecting certain results, while the superior generic volition remains unchanged. The only method, then, by which the human mind can regulate its emotions is through its *generic volitions.* The volition which decides what shall be the main object of interest and pursuit, decides also what shall be the future desires and emotions. This illustrates the declaration of Scripture, "that the carnal mind is not subject to the law of God, *neither indeed can be.*" It is as impossible for a mind, whose main object is to gain earthly and selfish enjoyment, to have all its emotions, desires and actions, regulated by the great law of perfect benevolence, as it is for a river to run down hill and run up at the same time.

If what has been presented is true, then the human mind has the power of making choice of the service of God, (which is the exercise of rational benevolence,) as the main object of interest and pursuit through life. God is a being of perfect rational benevolence, and he requires us to make it the main object of life to copy his example, to become like him. This was one great object when God became "manifest in the flesh," to set us an example of a perfect benevolence in all the circumstances of trial and temptation to which we are made subject. The ruling principle of the Saviour was rational benevolence, and every species of gratification was made secondary and subordinate to this. It is those who take Him for their pattern, and make it the chief aim of life to conform to it, who come the nearest to complete success. All through the blessed career of the self-denying Howard, we find him looking to the Saviour as his pattern of imitation; and, ever unsatisfied with present attainments, he left as his last direction to his friends, that his funeral sermon should be from the text which he said best expressed his feelings, "*I shall be satisfied* when I awake with thy likeness."

ARTICLE VIII.

Review of Hengstenberg's Christology.

By Rev. J. Packard, Prof in the Prot Epis. Theol. Sem. of Virginia.

Christology of the Old Testament, and a Commentary on the predictions of the Messiah by the Prophets. By E. W. Hengstenberg, Doctor of Phil. and Theol., and Professor of the latter in the University of Berlin. Translated from the German, by Reuel Keith, D. D., Professor in the Prot. Epis. Theol. Sem. of Virginia. In three volumes. Washington, D. C.: Wm. M. Morrison. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. New-York: Gould, Newman & Saxton. Philadelphia: Wm. Marshall & Co., 1839. pp. 560, 423, 496.

Before remarking on the above work, we propose to show, very briefly, that many predictions of the Old Testament referred specifically to our Saviour. We shall do this by appealing to his authority, and to that of his apostles; and by comparing the descriptions of the Messiah, which we find in the Old Testament, with the earthly ministration of Jesus Christ.

When our risen Lord drew near to the disciples who were going to Emmaus, after chiding them for doubting that, according as the prophets had spoken, Christ must suffer and enter into his glory, he began "at Moses and all the prophets, and expounded unto them, in all the Scriptures, the things concerning himself"* Shortly after, he stood in the midst of the eleven and said unto them, "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you; that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of *Moses*, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures; and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day."† When questioned publicly by two of John's disciples, "Art thou

* Luke 24: 25—27. † Luke 24: 44, 45.

he that should come, or look we for another?"* he answered, by referring to the fulfilment of those prophecies, which describe the marvellous works of the Messiah: "The blind receive their sight, the lame walk,"† etc. Acting on the authority committed to them by Christ, the apostles boldly asserted the reference of the prophets to their Saviour. "The spirit of Christ which was in them," "testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow."‡ "Those things, which God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer—he hath so fulfilled."§ Peter affirmed, "To him give all the prophets witness;" and Paul likewise, "In him all the promises of God are yea and amen."‖

The general descriptions of the Messiah have their full accomplishment only in Jesus Christ. It was promised to Abraham, that in him should "all the nations of the earth be blessed;" which Paul interprets as "*preaching the gospel* unto Abraham."¶ God promised to David, that "his seed should endure for ever; that the throne of his kingdom should be established for ever, as the days of heaven, and as the sun before him; that David should never want a man to sit upon his throne."** The Jews applied these prophecies to the Messiah. "We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth for ever"†† But the children of Israel have abode many days without a prince and without a king.‡‡ In the time of Christ they had no king but Cæsar. Jesus Christ is therefore the true king of Israel. The Lord God hath given him "the throne of his father David," and he reigns "over the house of Jacob"—the Israelites indeed—"for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end."§§ "The root of Jesse shall stand as an ensign—a standard to the people;" and "unto him shall the gathering of the people be."‖‖

When we come to the more specific descriptions of the Messiah, we see that they can refer to none other than

---

* Matt. 11: 3. † Matt. 11: 4, 5. ‡ 1 Pet. 1: 11.
§ Acts 3: 18. ‖ Acts 10: 43; 2 Cor. 1: 20.
¶ Gen. 12: 1–3; 18: 18; 22: 18; 26: 4; Gal. 3: 8.
** 2 Sam. 7: 16; 1 Kings 9: 5; Ps. 72; 89: 4, 29, 36; Ps. 110: 4; Jer. 33: 14–17. †† John 12: 34. ‡‡ Hosea 3: 4.
§§ Luke 1: 31–33. ‖‖ Is. 11: 10; Gen. 49: 10.

Jesus Christ. Though his goings were from of old, from everlasting, and though styled "the Everlasting Father," he must be born in Bethlehem of Judea. This was the general expectation of the Jews; and when Herod demanded of the chief Priests and Scribes where Christ should be born, they replied, "In Bethlehem of Judea, for thus it is written by the Prophet.* The Messiah was to be of the stem of Jesse—a righteous branch, raised up out of his roots—called from hence, "My servant David." All the people, at the time of Christ, were in expectation that Christ should come of the seed of David. "And of this man's seed, God, according to his promise, raised unto Israel a Saviour," Jesus Christ, who was made "of the seed of David," and "of his house and lineage."

According to the prophets, he must be "despised and rejected of men," "a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence,"—especially to the house of Israel—"a root out of a dry ground, without form or comeliness." He was to be wounded, bruised, scourged, oppressed, by an unjust sentence cut off from the land of the living, stricken, spit upon; yet his soul would be a sin-offering, and the work of redemption would be finished by his bloody death.† This was fulfilled to the minutest circumstance, even to the parting his garment, and casting lots for his tunic.‡ Christ "hath once suffered, the just for the unjust;" "his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree;" "by whose stripes we are healed."§

The office of the Messiah was to be "a prophet like unto Moses," "mighty in word and deed before God and all the people;" to be a king who should "order and establish his kingdom, and execute judgment and justice."‖ For these ends he was to be endowed with abundant qualifications. "The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him; the Spirit of wisdom and understanding; the Spirit of counsel and might; the Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord;" because "the Lord hath anointed him to preach the gospel to the poor, to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty

---

* Mich. 5: 2; Matt. 2: 5, 6. † Is. 52: 13; 53: 12; 8: 14; Ps. 22: 1, 17.

‡ Matt. 27: 35; Mark 15: 24; Luke 23: 34; John 19: 23.

§ 1 Pet. 2: 24; 3: 18. ‖ Deut. 18: 15, 20; Is. 9: 7.

to the captives." In the course of his ministration "the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped; the lame man shall leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing." "He shall feed his flock like a shepherd, and carry the lambs in his bosom." "My righteous servant shall justify many, for he shall bear their iniquity." "He shall make reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in everlasting righteousness."* So prevalent were these expectations, that the ignorant Samaritan woman, who received only the Pentateuch, said of the Messiah, "When he is come, he will tell us all things;"† and Simeon, who was waiting for the consolation of Israel, like a second Jacob, exclaimed: "Mine eyes have seen thy salvation—a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel."‡

We have thus given a brief synoptical view of the Messianic prophecies. We have chosen to quote them at length, and leave the reader to compare them with their fulfilment in the New Testament. Thus he will be able to give "a reason of the faith that is in him" in these predictions, and exhibit the biblical evidence on which they rest. We love to dwell on the foreshadowings of the hope of Israel; to trace the footsteps of the Saviour among the saints of old; and we do not fear that it will be "grievous" to our readers to do likewise. Besides, these prophecies may be placed in such a position, as to reflect light on each other, and thus add to their mutual strength. Like the diamond, of which Solomon says, "whithersoever it turneth it prospereth,"—shineth—so does Scripture give out light at every angle, and at every point of view. Oh! that the men of God were more diligent in studying and weighing every expression of the prophecies, and finding Him of whom Moses and the prophets wrote, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God! How much would they gain by doing it! How much do they lose by not doing it! How much more firmly would the people of their charge be rooted and grounded in the faith, if they were fed with the wisdom and knowledge of prophecy!

And what study more profitable and delightful, than the *growth* of prophecy? Who, that takes pleasure in seeking

* Is. 11: 2; 35: 5; 42: 1; 53: 11. † John 4: 25.
‡ Luke 2: 30.

out the order of God's working in nature, can fail to be struck with the analogy in the gradual development of prophecy. It is the least of all seeds in Genesis; but it grows up—we know not how, occulto velut arbor ævo – to be the greatest of trees, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in its branches;—a cloud, at first no bigger than a man's hand, but gathering size and volume as it sweeps along, till finally it fills the whole heaven. To use the beautiful comparison of Leighton, "The sweet stream of prophecy did, as the rivers, make its own banks fertile and pleasant as it ran by, and flowed still forward to after ages; and by the confluence of more such prophecies, grew greater as it went, till it fell in with the main current of the gospel in the New Testament, both acted and preached by the great prophet himself, whom they foretold as to come, and recorded by his apostles and evangelists, and thus united in one river clear as crystal. This doctrine of salvation in the Scriptures hath still refreshed the city of God, his church under the gospel, and still shall do so, till it empty itself into the ocean of eternity."* First, there is the promise in general terms. Salvation is to come from the posterity of the woman; then through the family of Shem; from this family Abraham is selected; from his sons, Isaac; from the sons of Isaac, Jacob; from the twelve sons of Jacob, Judah—the ancestor of David. We see that in prophecy a thousand years are with the Lord as one day; that he is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but that he that shall come, will come, and will not tarry. More than 4000 years elapsed between the first promise, and "the voice of one crying in the wilderness." Four centuries intervened between the prophecy of Malachi and its fulfilment in John the Baptist; yet, prophecy bridges the gulf between the Old and New Testaments. Jesus Christ is the centre of them both, the hope of the former, and the glory of the latter. Perhaps so long an interval was necessary, in order to familiarize the minds of men with the idea of a Messiah. They must see and feel their everlasting need, and the exceeding desirableness of a Saviour, before he would be granted. They must cry out, with an exceeding great and bitter cry,

* Vol. I. 170. London, 1835. See also a most beautiful illustration of Is. 9: 1, in Vol. II. 77.

for light and a teacher sent from God,—feeling and knowing that they were in darkness. False religions must have their day, and run their course; to convince men that they could could find no rest for the sole of their foot, but in the ark of God.*

The work of Hengstenberg is a systematic and scientific exhibition of the testimony of the Old Testament to Christ. It is in fact a highly valuable commentary on the Messianic prophecies. It points out how far the events recorded in the New Testament were the fulfilment of predictions in the Old. This has never been attempted before, to the same extent, and the present work supplies a desideratum which has long been felt. We know of nothing in the English language, which occupies the same ground. Our books on prophecy generally attempt nothing farther, than, assuming the reference of a particular prediction by a sort of hereditary interpretation, to make the event tally, often by a strained exegesis, in the minutest particular.

The work of Dr. John Pye Smith, on "the Scripture testimony to the Messiah," and the old work of Kidder on the Messiah, are, in some respects, exceptions to these remarks. The former, though unfortunately arranged, contains much that is valuable; but the latter is a stranger to the fundamental exegesis of the present day. Dr. Smith does no sufficiently sift the prophecies of the Messiah; but considers some predictions as pointing to him, which we think untenable; and thus throws suspicion on those which are valid.† The works of Newton, Sherlock and Keith are popular, and devote more attention to other prophecies than those relating to Christ. As a specimen of the exegesis of Keith, we subjoin his interpretation of Jer. 31: 22, "A woman shall encompass a man,"—which he interprets as fulfilled in Christ being born of a virgin. The woman is Israel; the man is the Lord of Hosts; and the meaning doubtless is, that Israel shall return to her dependence and submission to him.

* See some striking remarks on this subject in Tholuck on the Nature and Moral influence of Heathenism. Bib. Repos. II. 272, 371.

† For example, Gen. 4: 1; Gen. 5: 28, 29; 1 Sam. 7: 18, 19; 2 Sam. 23: 1—7.

Again, he considers the passage, "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom," as strictly parallel with Zech. 13: 7, "I will turn my hand upon the little ones;" and still more, as a *fulfilment* of the prophecy contained in the latter passage.* The meaning of Zechariah doubtless is, I will bring back my hand in a good sense; that is, I will confer benefits on the little ones, who, according to the context, are the poor, dispersed sheep without a shepherd.

The character of Hengstenberg is well known to the readers of the Biblical Repository. There have been repeated notices of him in this work.† He is pronounced, even by the Rationalists, a young man of great learning. His work created quite a sensation among them; as they could hardly gainsay or resist the wisdom and power with which he spoke. They were forced to acknowledge, that he had broken a lance, well and truly, with their most redoubted champions. He early distinguished himself as an Arabic scholar, and thus became prepared for these investigations. He was better qualified for the task than any living scholar, by his unquestionable talent, his profound learning, and his evangelical spirit; and he has received the suffrages—"omne tulit punctum"—of the most distinguished biblical scholars of this country. Professor Stuart pronounces it a "masterly performance, a fine exhibition of enlightened and thorough philology and exegesis, and an able effort to vindicate and explain the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament." Professor Hodge considers it an "extensive and valuable work, better adapted to English and American readers than that of any other modern German author within his knowledge." We think Dr. Wiseman has very happily seized the peculiar characteristic of Hengstenberg; which he defines to be a "great felicity and tact, in unraveling the sense of obscure phraseology." We know of no one his superior in this respect. We know of no one who has that mark of a great mind in a higher degree, which is seen in the power of simplifying truth, clearing up the sense of obscure passages, and explaining difficult words by an easy and natural exegesis.

Beyond any German writer we are acquainted with,

* Keith, 287, 298.

† Vol. I. 21, 700. Vol. II. 139, 370, 11, 12.

Hengstenberg has the Anglo-Saxon mind. He is perfectly free from mysticism. On this account he is charged by some of the mystical interpreters with deficiency in depth. Tholuck remarks: "An abstract intellectual exegesis seems to us to predominate more than it ought; and to the disadvantage of that otherwise solid work, on the exposition of the Old Testament in Hengstenberg's Christology."* On this very account, it is intelligible to us, and suited to our latitude. Had it been otherwise, it would have slumbered on the shelves of some Leipsic bookseller; at least, its dust would never have been disturbed this side of the Atlantic. Hengstenberg has at least the merit of being consequent in his theological system—a praise which we cannot award to all his evangelical contemporaries. He does something more than admire the profound truth of the iron view of Calvinism. We have often wondered that Tholuck and Neander should have hesitated as to any essential doctrine of the Christian system—that they should not have seen, that the truths of Christianity are simply an organic whole. Tholuck is pleased to say of the English, that our whole disposition is practical; we are desirous, certainly, of arriving at some fixed and stable conclusions, but are deficient in depth of speculation. The German is more logical and *consequent;* he forms a theory for the sake of having one, and not for any practical purpose. In his Commentary on the Hebrews,† he charges Professor Stuart with being guilty of "*mechanismus*," for producing 230 *απαξ λεγομενα*, as a set-off to Seyfforth's 118, and remarks, that "such arguments will doubtless have great weight with his countrymen, who are so used to calculating."

For his consistency, Hengstenberg is called harsh and rigorous by his brethren. In conducting a theological journal, which is set for the defence of the gospel, and in maintaining the faith, he is frequently involved in controversy, and has the reputation, we think unjustly, of being polemical in his character. To all the opinions advanced in this work, we are not prepared to assent. We cannot agree to his literal interpretation of Isa. 11: 6, "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb." We think such an interpretation uncalled for by the exigency of the case, and not in harmony with

* Biblical Repository, Vol. III. 689. † Page 32.

parallel passages, which are clearly figurative. We think, too, that he generalizes some prophecies too much. He does not find a personal, individual Messiah in Gen. 3: 15.; nor in "the prophet like unto Moses." He is accustomed to regard particular and minute prophecies of the disgrace and ignominy of the Messiah, as "general traits, which, in the providence of God, were fulfilled in his history."* We think he may sometimes lay himself open to the charge of an artificial exegesis. Thus, on Isa. 11: 1, he supposes that the Messiah is designated as the sprout of Jesse, because the family of David had so much declined, as to be named after its humble progenitor. He finds the human and divine nature of the Messiah designated, where we can see nothing but the synonymous parallelism of Hebrew poetry. From an expression in relation to the prophets, that "they might have believed, *as the apostles did*, that the second coming of Christ *could* take place in their time," we infer that he has adopted the common German view on this subject. But these are "maculæ, ubi plurima nitent."†

We propose to give his views, in a desultory manner, on some important and interesting texts. He adopts the literal interpretation of Gen. 3: 15, and the existence of a real serpent, as the vehicle of the temptation by Satan. He quotes with approbation the fanciful opinion of Calvin, that our antipathy to the serpent, which we believe is not general, is derived from this source. He adopts the figurative interpretation of Gen. 9: 26, and understands by it, that true religion was to be preserved by the posterity of Shem, and imparted by them to the descendants of Japhet. He does not think that Paul asserts the necessity of interpreting זֶרַע, a collective noun, as singular; but that it was selected by the Holy Spirit, as having both a comprehensive and a restricted meaning.‡ He understands by Shiloh,§ a peacemaker—prince of peace—and opposes the view adopted by Dr. Smith and others, that it means, "whose right it is." He finds the literal fulfilment of Numb. 24: 17, in David, and in his smiting the Moabites.

Passing over Job 19: 25, 26, which Dr. J. P. Smith and Rosenmuller‖ apply to the resurrection at the last day, and

* Vol. II. 414. † Studien, etc. for 1835, p. 873.
‡ Gal. 3: 16. § Gen. 49: 10.
‖ "Eam oportet de *venturo Judicio, corporum resurrectione*.

the former refers to Christ, and also 2 Sam. 7: 23, "I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son," which he incidentally alludes to elsewhere, and interprets in a *double sense*, he comes to the Psalms. In the second of these he finds no proof text of the eternal generation of the Son; but gives a declarative meaning to "this day have I begotten thee." The resurrection he considers as a clear *proof to men* of the Sonship of Christ—as a fact whereby he was eminently declared to be the Son of God; and so interprets Rom. 1: 4. The seven Messianic Psalms he refers solely and exclusively to Christ, without finding in them any reference to David. He next presents us with a thorough and satisfactory examination of the phrase "Angel of the Covenant," and he proves it to imply the supreme divinity of Christ.

His chapter on the nature of prophecy will give rise to more discussion than any other.* He supposes that the prophets, during their visions, were in an ecstasy, in which they were deprived of consciousness and individual agency. This has been considered by some of his opposers as a petitio principii; and the effect of such a view is claimed to be the breaking down of all distinction between true prophets and heathen pretenders. As to his remarks on the obscurity of prophecy, if he means obscurity of *subjects*, andnot of language, we should not be careful to differ from him. We feel that we should be beating the air, to argue against our having a *more* sure word of prophecy from its fulfilment, than those to whom it was originally delivered.

In his remarks on the Nature of Prophecy, he incidentally gives an exposition of Matt. 24: 29.† He considers the ευθεως—"immediately"—as denoting the succession of objects in prophetic vision, and not as they were actually to take place. He elsewhere says,‡ "the assertion is erroneous that the representation in Matt. 24: 25, refers at the *same*

---

ultima, et rerum omnium insturationæ cogitasse." Ros. Jobus Red. p. 214. Mr. Noyes, in his Translation of Job, seems glad to find that there is no allusion to Christ, nor to a resurrection to a life of happiness, p. 147.

* For an extended answer by Prof. Stuart, see Biblical Repository, Vol. II. 217.

† Vol I. 229. ‡ Vol. III. 105.

time to the destruction of Jerusalem and the last judgment. The history of the world is a history of God's judgments, and the final judgment is the last and most complete realization of this idea."* In the same connection he alludes to that locus vexatissimus, 1 Pet. 3: 19, and thus expounds it: "Those who were once disobedient, when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, were not yet given up to final damnation, but kept in prison (the middle condition of שְׁאוֹל) until Christ came and preached to them."† His defence of the genuineness of the latter part of Isaiah, which, it is well known, has shared among the Germans the traditionary fate of its author among his countrymen—that of having been sawn asunder—will ever be considered a masterpiece of close argument. He combats the Rationalists with weapons as tried as their own. Nay, he *pits* them against each other; Ewald against Gesenius! The latter had asserted, from doctrinal prejudice, that Isa. 53: 8 could not refer to an individual, but must refer to the people, because the suffix was plural. Ewald comes forward, moved only by opposition to Gesenius—without caring for any of these things—and produces four or five passages where it is indubitably *singular*.‡ Such are the spoils which sanctified learning has won from the Egyptians! His style in the introduction rises to a degree of eloquence not usual with him. Indeed, throughout these volumes we find occasionally applications of peculiar closeness and pungency, and incidental remarks which evince great depth of religious feeling. This is true, particularly of the preliminary observations on the suffering and atoning Messiah.§ "*Man is made for Christ*, the atoning Saviour. This doctrine alone, all history shows, has power to restore the peace and tranquillity he has lost. The spirit of man is originally adapted to the vicarious satisfaction of the divine Redeemer."‖ He pursues the subject of substitution in a very profound manner. In commenting on Joel he remarks:¶ "Where corruption manifests itself

* With this we may compare the well known apothegm, "Die welt geschichte ist das welt gericht."

† Tholuck's opinion seems to be nearly the same: "Peter says the Saviour communicated the knowledge of redemption to those who died before his appearance."

‡ See Dr. Wiseman's Lectures, p. 333. § Vol. I. 193.

‖ See Bib. Repos. Vol. II. 264. ¶ Vol. III. 103.

in the church of the Lord, there punishment comes. Because God has sanctified himself *in* the church, so must he sanctify himself *upon* her, when she has become like the profane world. He cannot endure that, when the spirit has departed, the dead mass should continue to appear as his kingdom." "He strips off the mask of hypocrisy from his apostate church." He does not consider the locusts in Joel as literal, with Credner and others; but as symbolical of the outward enemies of the church. Nor does he understand literally the dreams and visions mentioned by the same prophet. There were neither on the day of Pentecost. The Jews did not expect them. The meaning is, They will enjoy the Spirit of God, with all its gifts and graces."* He considers the turning of the moon into blood, etc., as manifestations of God's penal justice, and the precursors of great judgments.† The imagery, he thinks, is borrowed from the plagues of Egypt; and he compares with them the phenomena mentioned by Josephus, which happened before the destruction of Jerusalem; which he does not seem to regard as colored by the Jewish historian. At the same time, he speaks with approbation of the explanation of Calvin, who treats them as "metaphoricæ locutiones." He does not find their full realization in any historical event.‡

We must not pass over his view of Isa. 7. He thinks the prophet saw the birth of the Messiah as present to his mind's eye, and borrowed from him his measure of time. He means to say that the land in two or three years will be freed from the invading kings. This he expresses by the time between the birth of the Messiah, and his attaining years of discretion; "until he shall know to choose the good, and refuse the evil." "Butter and honey shall he eat," he regards as an image of *want*, and not of plenty. The child, we are to remember, is the representative of the inhabitants

---

* Vol. III. 130. † Vol. III. 133.

‡ The explanation of such passages by Gesenius is, that great political revolutions are hyperbolically described as great convulsions of nature—the fall of great kingdoms as a shaking and sinking of the universe—their rise by the creation of a new heaven and a new earth. Is. 13: 13, 24, 19; 34: 4; Jer. 4: 23, 26; Joel 3: 15, 16; Is. 65: 17; 66: 22; Comm. Vol. I. 460.

of the land. He refutes the view adopted by the more ancient Jews, and, strange to say, by Dr. J. P. Smith,* "that the virgin was the queen of Ahaz, and the child king Hezekiah," by quoting Jerome; who proves that Hezekiah must have been at that time nine years old. In answer to the objection, "How could the birth of Jesus, which happened 742 years after, be a sign to Ahaz, that, within three years, his kingdom should be freed from his enemies?" he says, "The sign was not intended for Ahaz alone, but especially for the pious portion of the people." This objection would prove too much. It would do away the prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The promise of the Messiah involved the preservation of the state. He thinks the relation in chap. 8 wholly different, and that it refers to a son actually born to the prophet. We think this method more satisfactory than the typical one, or than finding here a two-fold application.† He rejects the view of Chandler, Benson, Usher, Kennicott, that there is a change of subject in ver. 16, and that the prophet by the child means Shear-jashub.

His remarks on the symbolical actions of the prophets, and especially Hosea, will be read with great interest. Is it consistent with the character of God, that they should have literally performed some actions ascribed to them? or were they performed in prophetic vision? or are they parabolic? The prophets are often said to do, what they only announce, or what will certainly happen. This may serve as a key to some of the difficulties. Hengstenberg is against the view, that what is recorded in the first chapters of Hosea, outwardly happened; and he speaks with very little respect of Stück, who maintains this opinion.‡

In his remarks on the terminus ad quem of Daniel's seventy weeks, he advances the opinion that the time of Christ's pub-

---

* Scrip. Test. Vol. I. 359, 3d edition.

† See Stuart on the Hebrews, p. 571, 572, 573, and Stowe's Introduction, p. 32.

‡ See Ez. 4, 5, and 24 chap.; Is. 20: 2; Jer. 27: 1, 2; 1 Sam. 15: 27, 28; Jer. 25: 15—28, for the most important passages. Would that some one, in the spirit and power of Lowth, would rise up to give this subject a thorough investigation.

lic appearance *can be accurately* designated.* Ideler has proved that it was from the beginning of the *actual* reign of Tiberius, and not from his adoption by Augustus. If we can ascertain the time of John's entrance upon his ministry, which we can do, that of Jesus would necessarily follow. Tiberius began to reign 767 U. C. In answer to the objection, that there can be no definite designations of time in Daniel, for the Redeemer himself says, that he was ignorant of the day of judgment, and it cannot be supposed that Daniel had a knowledge of them, he replies, that the ground of our Saviour's refusal was the condition of the disciples. They were carnal. Such knowledge was too high for them, and would have been injurious. As to Christ's ignorance, his view is, that in his humiliation he possessed neither power to work miracles, nor foreknowledge. These were always granted in answer to prayer; for the Father heard him *always*, and showed him *all* things in consequence of his unity of will with the Father. His ignorance in this case was voluntary. He did not choose to pray for a knowledge which would have been unsuitable. He thinks that Bengel has admirably refuted those who argue against definite designations of time in the Apocalypse.

In conclusion, we cannot but commend the devotional spirit which pervades the work. In his preface to the first volume, the author prays, "that the Lord of the church may bless a work—begun in dependence on him—and make it the means of confirming the faith of some." Like Milton, he deemed that such a business was not to be entered upon, "without devout prayer to that eternal Spirit, that can enrich with all utterance and knowledge, and sends out his seraphim with the hallowed fire of his altar, to touch and purify the lips of whom he pleases." From a feeling like this—at once fervid, pure and rational—we might expect such a work. From his preface to the last volume, we may infer that he received divine assistance. "With heartfelt thanks to God, who giveth power to the faint, and to them that have no might increaseth strength, the author sees himself at the end of a long, and often difficult, course of seven years. From the beginning he has earnestly sought for strength, and has received increasing light the longer he has studied." Would

* Vol. II. 393.

that such a spirit were more prevalent among the German commentators!

This "opus septem annorum," like the immortal work of Milton, "posterity will not willingly let die." May it shed a never-setting light on the book of God! We recommend it most cordially to the study of those who would enjoy the blessedness of that man who reads and understands the sure word of prophecy, who *searches* the Scriptures *daily*, to see whether they testify of Christ; for the "testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy."

One word as to the translation, and we have done. We have compared it, to some extent, with the original, and can testify that the translator has attained his object of "putting us in possession of the thoughts of the author; so that the translation is to the English reader, what the original is to the German." It is in good, hearty mother-English, with a strong infusion of the Saxon, in whose roots lie the sinews of our language. It is plain and idiomatic; and this is more than we can say of many of our translations from the German. We find in it no such compounds as ethico-religious, anti-psychological, etc. Our language is unfitted for these combinations; and we are sometimes alarmed at the threatened deluge of Germanicisms. Our translators would do well to study our older writers. They approximate far more closely to the German in their modes of expression, with their old, unpolluted English, than we moderns do.

ARTICLE IX.

The Doctrine of Christian Perfection, Explained and Defended; with some Strictures on Mr. Folsom's "Review of Mahan on Christian Perfection." Am. Bib. Repos. for July, 1839.

By Rev. Asa Mahan, President of the Oberlin Collegiate Institute, Oberlin, Ohio.

Explanatory Note by the Editors.

[The doctrine of Christian Perfection, as recently promulgated by the writer of this article, and some others, has attracted so much attention, that it seems worthy of a more specific and thorough examination than it has yet received; and, having permitted the little volume by Mr. Mahan to be reviewed in a former No. of the Repository, we have thought it proper, and for the interests of truth, to allow him space for a brief statement and defence of the doctrine in question on the pages of the same work. We are not to be understood, however, as cherishing views in accordance with the main point here attempted to be established. Several of the writer's positions we regard as untenable. Yet they are the strong arguments in support of the doctrine, and we are glad to present them to our readers, so condensed and clearly stated. In this form they may hereafter be met without any danger of misapprehension; and our expectation is that they will be examined in a future No. of the Repository. We do not propose to encourage a long controversy on this subject, but trust that a single article, in reply to the following, will be all that will be judged necessary to place the truth in clear light. For the present we refer our readers to the article by Dr. Pond on the same subject, in the Repository for January, 1839, and also to Mr. Folsom's "Review."

It is due to Mr. Mahan to state, that we have stricken from his manuscript several paragraphs which seemed irrelevant to his principal purpose, and have also omitted to insert several passages marked for quotation from his book, the entire substance of which is repeated in his present article. But we have been careful to exclude nothing which could contribute in any measure to the support of his main positions.]

Near the commencement of his review, Mr. Folsom remarks: "It was due from Mr. Mahan to his brethren, and to the cause of truth, to present, in the outset, the real question at issue; to state what they believed and what they did not believe." Have I not done precisely what Mr. Folsom says I ought to have done? Has he not himself overlooked or misapprehended what I have said upon the subject; and for this reason misstated the question at issue between the advocates and opposers of the doctrine of Christian Perfection? That the reader may form a correct judgment in respect to this subject, I will cite a passage from the work reviewed. After endeavoring to explain the nature of the doctrine, and the important points of agreement between its advocates and opposers, I thus state the question in respect to which we differ: "We will now, in the second place, consider the question in respect to which they differ. It is the simple question, *Whether we may now, during the progress of the present life, attain to entire perfection in holiness, and whether it is proper for us to indulge the anticipation of making such attainments.* One part of the church affirm, that the perfect obedience which God requires of us, we may render to him. The other affirm, that it is criminal for us to *expect* to render that obedience. One part affirm that we ought to aim at entire perfection in holiness, with the expectation of attaining to that state. The other part affirm, that we ought to aim at the same perfection in holiness, with the certain expectation of not attaining to that state. On the one hand, it is affirmed, that we ought to pray that the "very God of peace will sanctify us wholly, and preserve our whole spirit, and soul, and body, blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," with the expectation, that God will answer our prayers by the bestowment of that very blessing. On the other hand, it is affirmed, that we ought to put up that identical prayer, with the certain expectation of not receiving the blessing which we 'desire of him.' On the one hand, it is affirmed that grace is provided in the gospel to render the Christian, even in this life, 'perfect in every good work to do the will of God.' On the other hand, it is affirmed, that no such grace is provided."

In respect to the question, as here stated, I conceive the advocates and opposers of the doctrine of Christian perfection are really at issue. The question is entirely distinct from

the question, What attainments do Christians actually make? Now, how shall this question be settled, viz. the question whether we are authorized to aim at and pray for "perfection" with the expectation of attaining it? Not by a reference to our natural ability. This may exist in all its fulness, with the absolute certainty that no attainments at all in holiness will be made. This is in fact true of all fallen spirits, and with all mankind in the absence of the influence of the grace of the gospel. But suppose it to be shown, that provisions are made and revealed in the gospel, for this specific object, the entire sanctification of Christians in this life; and that specific promises to that effect are there given. Are we not, then, as fully authorized to expect *perfect*, as *partial* holiness in this life? It is "by the promises" that we are to be "made partakers of the divine nature." When we have determined the nature and extent of "the promises," have we not determined the degree of holiness which we are authorized to expect? The question, then, What are the nature and extent of "the promises?" is a question of fundamental importance to us as Christians. Now, it is upon *this question*, that the advocates of the doctrine of Christian perfection are endeavoring to fix the attention of the church. They contend that there are three questions connected with this doctrine. 1. What is the natural ability of men? or, have men natural ability to yield perfect obedience to the commands of God? In respect to this question, most Christians agree. 2. Are we authorized, in view of the provisions and promises of divine grace, together with the other teachings of inspiration, to expect to attain to a state of perfect holiness in this life? 3. Do the Scriptures teach us that any *have attained*, or *will attain* to a state of entire sanctification in this life? The opposers of this doctrine overlook entirely the second question, and fasten upon the third, as the only important question in respect to which we are at issue.

In the book reviewed by Mr. F., the second is the great question to which the attention of the reader is perpetually directed. The third is referred to only incidentally, and that on account of its bearing on the main question. The argument under this head is this: We are authorized to expect to attain to a state of entire sanctification in this life, because the Scriptures inform us, that others have attained to that

state. Every thing is said as a means to one end—the determination of the great question, To what degree of holiness do the Scriptures authorize us to *expect* to attain in this life? That which is practicable to us on the ground of our natural ability, is in one sense attainable. That which is rendered practicable, not on the ground of natural ability, but by the provisions of divine grace, is attainable in a different and higher sense of the term. It is in this last sense, that the term is used by me throughout the entire work under consideration.*

Mr. F. meets the arguments adduced to sustain my position by starting another and different question, and then replying to that, and not the one which I had started. This will appear evident as we proceed to consider his reply to my arguments.

The first argument to sustain the position that perfection in holiness is attainable in this life, is thus stated. "The Bible positively affirms that provision is made in the gospel for the attainment of that state, and that to make such provision is one of the great objects of Christ's redemption."† To sustain this declaration, the following passages are cited: Rom. 8: 3, 4. 1 Pet. 2: 24. 2 Cor. 5: 15. 1 Pet. 1: 4. 2 Cor. 7: 1. But Mr. F. replies, that this does not prove that any will attain to that state, and consequently, "proves nothing respecting the real question at issue, unless it be contended, that the object of the Saviour's coming, being, as Mr. Mahan states, to raise Christians to a state of perfect and perpetual holiness in this life, that object has failed of being accomplished, except so far as real Christians have been raised to such a state." I reply: The fact that provision is made in the gospel for the entire *justification* of sinners, does not, by itself, prove that any actually are justified. But does it not authorize us to seek for that blessing with the expectation of obtaining it? For the same reason, does not the fact, that provision is made in the gospel for the entire *sanctification* of Christians in this life, authorize us to seek for that state, with the expectation of attaining to that also? If the fact that provision is made in the gospel for the declared and specific object of putting us in possession of a certain blessing, does not authorize us to seek for that blessing, with the ex-

* See pp. 19, 20, etc. † Page 20.

pectation of obtaining it, how can it be shown that we are authorized to seek for any blessing promised in the Bible, with the expectation of obtaining it?

My second argument is thus stated:* "Perfection in holiness is promised to the Christian in the New Covenant, under which he is now placed. The moral law, as all admit, requires *perfect* and *perpetual* holiness. The position assumed is, that whatever is *required* of us by the moral law, is definitely *promised* to us in the gospel. In 2 Pet. 1: 4, we are informed, that it is "by the promises," that we are to be rendered "partakers of the divine nature;" that is, of the holiness and blessedness of God, and "escape the corruption that is in the world through lust." If it can be shown, that perfection in holiness is definitely pledged to us in "the promises," then I affirm, that they authorize us to expect perfection in holiness.

To show that the promises do authorize us to expect perfection in holiness, the following, among other passages of Scripture, were cited. Jer. 32: 39, 40. Ez. 36: 25. Deut. 30: 6. Jer. 1: 20. 1 Thes. 5: 23, 24.†

Let us look particularly at two or three of these passages. Deut. 30: 6, "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul. In Deut. 10: 12, the following question is asked: "And now, Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but to fear the Lord thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to love him, and to serve the Lord thy God, with all thy heart and with all thy soul?" Now, why are we told that the phrase, "with all thy heart and with all thy soul," in the latter passage, and in all the precepts of the Bible, implies *perfect holiness*, while in the former passage the same phrase implies but *partial holiness?* If this construction is to be put upon this phrase in Deut. 30: 6, why not in all other instances?

1 Thess. 5: 23, 24, "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly," &c. The original term here translated *wholly*, is composed of two terms, each of which means perfection. Hence Professor Robinson renders it "wholly complete, perfect." The term rendered *whole* in the succeeding clause, is also a strong intensive. The true meaning of the passage

* Page 22. † Pages 83, 84.

may be thus expressed: *The very God of peace so sanctify you, as to render you wholly perfect; and I pray God, your entire spirit, and soul, and body, be so preserved, that when your lives, as Christians, shall be reviewed at the coming of Christ, you may be found to have been blameless.* If this is not a prayer for perfection in holiness, we may safely affirm, that it is not in the power of the Greek language to express that idea. But does the apostle here pray that Christians may be thus sanctified and preserved in this life; or, as Mr. F. supposes, "at the coming of Christ?" That we ought to understand the passage in the former and not in the latter sense, I argue from these considerations: 1. The terms "spirit, soul, and body," as most, if not all, admit, refer to the "immortal soul, the animal life, and the mortal body." These surely can be preserved blameless only in this life. 2. The Scriptures speak of our being *presented* blameless at the coming of Christ; but never of our being sanctified and *preserved* blameless *at* that day. We have, then, in this passage, 1. A prayer dictated by direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit, that God will render us, in this life, perfect in holiness, and preserve us in that state until the coming of Christ. 2. We are authorized by a positive promise, to look to God for this identical blessing, with the assurance that he will then thus sanctify and preserve us. "Faithful is he that calleth you, who also will do it." Such is the nature of the argument based upon the promises contained in these and kindred passages. The form of the argument is this: For whatever is directly promised to us in the gospel, we are authorized to look to God with the expectation of receiving it at his hands. Perfection in holiness is definitely promised to us in the gospel. We are therefore authorized to look to God to be "sanctified wholly," with the full and joyful expectation of being thus sanctified by his grace. Here Mr. F., as in the former instance, evades the question as stated by me, and replies to the argument, as if it were directed to another and different point. "This," he says, "proves nothing to the point, unless it can be proved that Christians perform every condition of the promises, and avail themselves fully of every privilege." Until Christians know what their privileges are, they will not of course avail themselves of them. To show Christians, not what their actual *attainments* are, but what are their *privileges*, is the exclusive object of the

argument under consideration. But Mr. F. maintains that the Bible affirms, that no one does, as a matter of fact, comply with these conditions. Now, what must be the influence of promising the richest blessings to us, upon certain conditions, and then requiring us to believe, that with these conditions we shall never comply? What is this, but to take the most effectual means conceivable to defeat the very end for which "the promises" were given, and practically to place us in the same relation to the attainment of the blessing, that we should be in, were its attainments known to be a natural impossibility?

"The third argument, from the commands of Scripture, only proves," says Mr. F., "human obligations, and implies capacity commensurate with obligations; but not that any man perfectly obeys, or that any will obey." But this is no reply to the argument, as stated by me. I did not argue that perfection in holiness is attainable from the mere fact, that it is *required* of us; but from the "*manner* and *circumstances* in which such commands are given." We find the command, "be perfect," clustered with others, to which all admit that obedience is not only *required*, but *expected*. Why is this one precept selected from the midst of others, given at the same time and in the same circumstances, as the solitary command to which obedience is not expected? We find, also, the same writers presenting this and kindred precepts in the same manner and circumstances that they do others to which obedience is known to be expected. We have, then, the same evidence, that obedience to this command is expected of us, that we have, that it is expected to any precept of the Bible that can be named.*

The fourth argument is drawn from the prayer dictated by our Saviour to his disciples, together with the one put up by him in behalf of the church, on the evening preceding his crucifixion. Mr. F. replies by asking, "Can it be proved, that the period will ever come when the will of God will be done on earth as universally and as perfectly as it is done in heaven?" I suppose it can, and that the petition under consideration, as well as other passages of Scripture, contains such proof. The reasoning of Mr. F., however, does not meet the arguments as stated by me.

---

* See 1 Tim. 6: 13, 14.

In respect to the prayer of Christ, John 17: 20, 23, that Christians "may be one, even as we are one," and that "they may be made perfect in one," "it is mere assumption," Mr. F. says, "that the union [here] prayed for is one of absolute perfection in love." That such a union is implied in such language, he then denies, and affirms that the union referred to "has its fulfilment in that brotherly love which excludes division and strife, and draws forth the exclamation of the world: Behold how these Christians love one another!" How, then, can a union of perfect love be expressed, if such language does not express it? And how can it be shown from the Bible, that such a union exists between the Father and the Son, or among the spirits of the "just made perfect" in heaven? If, on the other hand, it is admitted that a union of perfect love is here prayed for, can we avoid the inference, that the union here prayed for will exist among true Christians, or the world will never believe in Christ? The existence of such love is declared to be the condition of such a belief. "That the world may believe;" "that the world may know that thou hast sent me."

The fifth argument is drawn from the fact, that inspired men made the attainment of this particular state the subject of definite, fervent, and constant prayer. As examples of such prayers, Col. 4: 12; Heb. 13: 20, 21; and 1 Thes. 5: 23, were cited. From the fact that such prayers are in conformity with the prayer dictated by our Saviour to the church, and with his own in her behalf, and that they were all dictated by direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit, it was argued, that we are authorized to put up similar petitions in our own behalf, with the expectation of receiving the blessing for which we pray.

In reply to this argument, Mr. F. suggests, 1. That the phrases "sanctify you wholly," that "ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God," and "make you perfect in every good work to do his will," mean simply "maturity in Christian knowledge and virtue;" or a state of mature but imperfect sanctification. 2. That "desire is prayer." According to this, Paul, in the instance referred to by Mr. F., must have prayed at one and the same time, that he might and might not depart. In the language of poetry, "Prayer is the soul's desire, unuttered or expressed." In the theological sense, it is, I suppose, *asking* God to grant us

what we choose, prefer, or regard as a good. Till we know what we ought to prefer, we do not know what we ought to pray for. Till we have reason to suppose that a thing is or may be "agreeable to the will of God," we cannot know that it is proper for us to pray for it. When we know that a thing is not according to the will of God, do we not know, that for that it is not proper to pray? The prayer of Christ, "if it be possible," etc., is not an exception to this principle; because in this form the petition was agreeable to the will of God. Now, according to the theory of Mr. F., we know certainly, that God has changelessly determined, not to "sanctify any of his people wholly" in this life; nor to grant any requests put up for such a blessing. How, then, can he show that, upon his theory, it is proper to pray for entire holiness in this life? What is mocking God, if asking him to do that which he requires us to believe he will not do, is not?

One consideration, here, is worthy of special attention.

When we pray for this, or any other blessing, do not the Scriptures authorize us to expect *more* than we "ask or think?" Does not the apostle, after praying for this specific blessing, expressly teach this sentiment, Eph. 3: 20? "Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think." But Mr. F.'s theory would require us to expect less than we "ask and think."

The sixth argument is based upon the fact, that the richest blessings are promised to us in the Bible, on the specific condition of the existence of perfect holiness in us. Mr. F. replies, 1. By saying that the argument "fails, because it is mere assumption." Whether it is so, whether such passages as Is. 26: 3; Mat. 6: 22; 2 Cor. 13: 11, and Phil. 4: 6, 7, are not cases in point, the reader must decide. Attention is also invited to the following: Mat. 5: 48, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Matt. 7: 24, 25, "Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken him," &c. Here, surely, the richest blessings are promised on the specific condition of perfect holiness in us.

But, 2. He says, "Thousands of saints, like Payson, Brainerd, and Griffin, though they have felt conscious of not being delivered from all sin, have had these precious promises fulfilled in their hearts." To this I have only to reply, that if either of those men of God knew what it was to be

"*kept in perfect peace*," their biographers, and their own journals, have most strangely misrepresented their experience. Nor is it possible for any person to be *kept* in this state, till his holiness is perfect.

I will pass by the seventh argument in this place, as it is my design to take it up by itself.

The eighth is drawn from the fact, that for every incentive to sin from within and around us, a specific remedy is provided and revealed in the gospel. "This," Mr. F. says, "properly belongs to the first, and has therefore already been answered."

By no means, I reply. In the first, the Bible, as we have seen, affirms, in general terms, that provision is made in the gospel for our full redemption from all iniquity, and for our "perfection and completeness in all the will of God." In *this* it was shown that it descends to particulars, and points out for every incentive to sin, for every form of temptation, from the "world, the flesh, and the devil," a specific remedy. These two facts, taken together, present the strongest argument in favor of the doctrine of Christian perfection. In this form, neither Mr. F. nor any other individual has, so far as my knowledge extends, met the argument.

The ninth argument, Mr. F. has answered by a mere assertion. I will therefore let it pass.

The tenth was drawn from the "striking contrast between the language of inspiration and that of the church, wherever the church has denied this doctrine." The language referred to is that which is in common use, from the "pulpit, the press, and in the common walks of life." From this contrast it is argued, that the church and the sacred writers hold different sentiments upon this subject. Who has not observed that a Calvinist and Arminian, when upon their knees, adopt a phraseology precisely similar, while, under other circumstances, they widely differ in their language; and that this coincidence and difference arise from the coincidence of their practical convictions in one condition, and from the diversity of their views under other circumstances? So of the church. On her knees and in her covenants, she fully expresses the doctrine of Christian perfection. Under other circumstances, she expresses sentiments totally opposite. In the former instance, her language corresponds with that of the sacred writers. In the latter, it widely differs from

theirs. Now, the argument is, that this coincidence and difference arise from the fact, that the practical convictions of the church correspond with those of the sacred writers in the former case, and differ from them in the latter. In this form, neither Mr. F. nor any other person, has, to my knowledge, met the argument.

In regard to the eleventh argument, to which Mr. F. has not replied, I would remark, that it remains with those who deny the doctrine under consideration, to show the consistency and propriety of the conduct of the church, in requiring her members, in her covenants, to pledge themselves to do that which, in her creeds, she requires them to believe they never will do. If it is "better not to vow, than to vow and not pay," much more is it better "not to vow" than to vow with the certain and declared expectation of not paying.

The following positions, assumed in the twelfth argument, Mr. F. does not deny:

1. "No evil can result from the belief of this doctrine, provided we keep the true standard of holiness distinctly in view." What evil can result from our aiming at perfection in holiness, with the expectation of attaining it, unless we lose sight of the *standard* at which we are required to aim?

2. This doctrine "involves the very principle that is considered necessary to efficient action on all other subjects." On all subjects, except religion, it is universally admitted, that the belief, that one will not attain to a certain state, cuts the nerve and sinew of all effort for the attainment of that state.

3. That it is the indispensable duty of all to *aim* at perfection in holiness. Now, the principle which I assumed and still maintain, as demonstrably evident, is this; that the belief, that as a matter of fact, we never shall attain to a certain state, renders it as impracticable to aim at that state, as the belief that its attainment is an impossibility.

To illustrate this principle, I adduced two suppositions; that of a hunter pointing his weapon at the moon, with the belief, that to hit it is impossible, and that of an individual pointing his at a mark, under the full persuasion that, while all are naturally able to do it, no man ever did, or ever will hit it. The principle assumed is, that it is equally impossible for each of these individuals to aim at, or intend to hit his object. If Mr. F. denies this, he is met by the testimony

of universal consciousness, that no man ever did or can aim at, or intend to reach a point which he fully believes to lie beyond the line of all expectation. If, on the other hand, he admits the principle, he must also admit, as an insuperable objection to his theory, that it renders it impracticable for us to do that which all acknowledge to be our indispensable duty, to wit, to aim at perfection in holiness. The fact adduced by Mr. F., that artists and scholars have before the "mind's eye an ideal of excellence which to them is absolutely unattainable," is not in point. Such persons are actually aiming at that only which they regard as practicable, that is, an approach indefinitely near to the ideal before the mind. So of the Christian. He can *aim* at that point which he regards as lying within the circle of rational expectation, and no farther.

As Mr. F.'s reply to the last argument, which is drawn from the absurdity of the common theory, that the "Christian is always perfectly sanctified at, or a few minutes before death, and not at an earlier period," is only the expression of an opinion opposed to mine, I shall pass it by, and close this article with some remarks of a general character.

We are now prepared for the question, whether the sacred writers assert the fact, that any have attained, or that any will attain to this state in this life? I here assume the following positions: 1. The sacred writers assert the fact, that some of the ancient saints did, in this life, attain to a state of entire sanctification. 2. The Bible affirms, that to this state the church is to attain during the progress of her future history.

I. In regard to the first position, let us contemplate the consequences which must result from the supposition that God has revealed, and required us to believe, that no one ever has attained, or ever will attain, to a state of entire sanctification in this life. Such a revelation and requirement would tend, in the most effectual manner, to defeat the declared object of the gospel—the implicit faith and obedience of the people of God. What more effectual means could a parent, for example, take to prevent the implicit obedience of a child, than to require that child to believe that he will never render such obedience? The belief of the fact under consideration, as a revealed truth, would of itself, aside from all other influences, render entire obedience

on our part impracticable; at least, it would render disobedience an absolute certainty. One of the most distinguished divines in this country has laid down this principle as self-evident, that the belief, that there is an absolute certainty, that we shall never perform a certain act, places us *practically* in the same relation to that act, that we should be in, did we believe its performance to be a natural impossibility. Shall we then suppose that God has rendered obedience to his requirements thus impracticable? The revelation of provisions for our entire sanctification, together with that of multiplied promises to that effect, is the perfection of absurdity on the above supposition. A blessing pledged upon conditions with which we are required to believe we never shall comply, is not promised at all.

II. The manner in which the sacred writers speak upon this subject, is wholly irreconcilable with the supposition, that they intended to impress their hearers with the conviction, that no Christian ever did or ever will attain to this state in this life. That they made it the constant theme of their meditations, preaching, exhortations, conversation and prayers; that they urged it upon Christians as a sacred duty; that they held before their hearers the provisions and promises of divine grace, to induce them to press forward for its attainment, and that as a means to the same end, they dwelt much upon the blessedness of pure and "perfect love," none, I presume, will deny. We are bound, therefore, to suppose, in the absence of positive evidence to the contrary, that some of the sacred writers may have attained to this state. But,

III. The sacred writers positively affirm, that some did attain to this state. My remarks will be confined to two cases referred to in the work under consideration.

I begin with the character of Paul.

1. There is but one act of his Christian life recorded by the sacred writers, which is of a doubtful character. I refer to his controversy with Barnabas. With this exception, (and by but a few is even this regarded as an exception,) his whole Christian character, as portrayed by the pen of inspiration, is "perfect and entire, wanting nothing."

2. The apostle very frequently presents himself as an example to Christians, without any intimation, that in copying that example they will not do their entire duty. Phil.

4: 9, "Those things which ye have both learned and received, and heard and seen in me, do; and the God of peace shall be with you." Phil. 3: 17, "Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which walk so as ye have us for an ensample. 1 Cor. 11: 1, "Be ye followers of me, even as I am of Christ," that is, since I am an imitator of Christ, be ye imitators of me. Who would dare to apply such language to himself, who was conscious of not presenting to Christians a perfect pattern for their imitation?

3. The apostle appeals to his hearers and to God, as witnesses of the entire purity of his character. 1 Thes. 2: 16, "Ye are witnesses, and God also, how *holily, and justly, and unblamably*, we behaved ourselves among you that believe." Acts 20: 26, "Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men." Who that was conscious of continued shortcomings in duty, would dare to apply such language to himself? In Acts 24: 16, the apostle declares, that his aim was to have always a "conscience void of offence toward God, and toward men." In 2 Tim. 1: 3, and elsewhere, he represents himself as being in this very state: "I thank God, whom I serve from my forefathers with a pure conscience." Again: "I have lived in all good conscience before God unto this day." In 1 Tim. 1: 5, the apostle declares, that the "end of the commandment," i. e., all that God requires, "is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned." By what language can a man profess perfection in holiness, if the apostle in such passages has not done it?

4. The general representations which the apostle gives of his character, lead to the same conclusion: Gal. 2: 20, "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God."

As further proof, I now refer to Phil. 3: 12—17, the passage so often cited to disprove the doctrine of Christian perfection. The apostle here presents his character in two points of light. 1. In reference to a state of glory consequent on having victoriously finished his race as a Christian. In this respect he of course was not perfect; just as Christ in the same respect was not perfect, while in a state of humiliation on earth. 2. In reference to moral or Christian

character, contemplating himself as a runner in the Christian race for the crown of glory.

That the apostle lays claim to perfection in *holiness*, is evident from the following considerations. 1. He represents himself as putting forth his entire energies in the Christian race, which is all that is requisite to perfection of Christian character. 2. In this respect he declares himself perfect: "Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded." 3. He calls upon Christians to imitate his example, and that without any qualification: "Brethren, be ye followers together of me." If the apostle had represented himself as coming short in his duty, he certainly would not have thus called upon Christians to imitate his example.

An objection is sometimes made to the explanation here given of verse 12: It was needless for the apostle to affirm, that he was not yet perfected in glory. Of this his readers were of course aware. I answer, while the apostle did affirm his perfection in holiness, it was necessary, at the same time, that he should affirm, that he had not "attained" and was not "perfect" in glory; inasmuch as the error was then being spread abroad, that the "resurrection was already past," and thus the "faith of some had been overthrown." The same thing, as I believe, the apostle affirms of himself, Rom. 8: 2: "For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death;" the "law of sin and death" referred to in chapter 3. Such is the testimony of an inspired apostle to his own attainments as a Christian; testimony applicable only to a state of entire sanctification.

We will now contemplate the testimony of another apostle, 1 John, 3: 21, 4: 17, 18: "Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God." "Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment, because as he is, so are we in this world. There is no fear in love, but perfect love casteth out fear." In the first chapter of this epistle, the apostle informs Christians, that he was about to tell them what he knew to be true from actual observation and experience. He then states, 1. The condition of those whose hearts do not condemn them. They have "confidence toward God." 2. The effect of "perfect love." It "casteth out fear." 3. The

characteristics by which those who do and those who do not exercise "perfect love" may be distinguished from each other. "Perfect love casteth out fear." "He that feareth is not made perfect in love." From the above considerations, the following conclusions are to my mind undeniably evident. 1. As the apostle is professedly speaking of what he knew to be true, from observation and experience, he did know, from observation and experience, the effects of "perfect love." 2. There were those at that time, who had in his judgment attained to this state; else why did he give the characteristics by which such persons might be distinguished from those who have not made such attainments? Other examples might be adduced.

IV. The Bible affirms, that to this state the church shall attain during the progress of her future history. This I argue from the following considerations.

1. For this glorious consummation Christ has taught his whole church to pray, "Thy kingdom come: thy will be done on earth as in heaven." There is certainly a very strong presumption in favor of the occurrence of any consummation, in the fact, that Christ has required his whole church to pray for it.

2. For this consummation Christ not only prayed, but declared its occurrence to be essential to the conversion of the world. John 17: 20—23.

3. To bring about this consummation, is one of the revealed objects of his redemption, and purposes of his grace Eph. 5: 25–27, "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." The phrase, "by the word," i. e., a preached gospel, shows, that this passage is to be applied to the church in this world. Eph. 1: 9, 10, "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself; that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him." In the first passage above cited, we learn, that it is the object of Christ's redemption, perfectly to sanctify his church. In the last, it

is declared to be his purpose, in the "dispensation of the fulness of time," to accomplish this very object. What other meaning can we attach to the phrase, to "gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth?"

4. God has unconditionally promised this very consummation to the church, Jer. 31: 31—34; Heb. 8: 10—12; Ez. 36: 25—27; Jer. 50: 20; Ez. 37: 23. Here I would remark, that a promise may be unconditional to the church, and conditional to all individuals of whom the church is composed. God, for example, unconditionally promised to the seed of Abraham the land of Canaan. Yet no one generation could take possession of that land without faith in that promise. See Heb. 3: 19, and Numb. 32: 15. Such, however, was the nature of the promise, as to render it certain that some generation would believe, and take possession of the blessing. So of the promises of the new covenant; "*some must enter in.*" Yet such is the nature of those promises, that those only who understand them and embrace them by faith, can "enter in." There remaineth, therefore, a glorious consummation to the church. God shall "sprinkle clean water upon her, and she shall be clean." "From all her filthiness and from all her idols shall he cleanse her." "In those days and at that time, saith the Lord, the iniquity of Israel shall be sought for, and there shall be none; and the sins of Judah, and they shall not be found." "Neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with any of their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions."

When will the church understand the "riches of the glory of Christ's inheritance in the saints?" Then shall her "peace be as a river, and her righteousness as the waves of the sea."

5. The same thing is implied in other passages relating to the future glory of the church. Isa. 11: 1—9. The entire description here given is applicable only to a state of perfect moral purity. "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the seas." If sin remains in the bosom of the church, there will be something to "hurt and destroy." See, also, Isa. 2: 4, and 65: 25; Micah 4: 1—4; Zech. 14: 20. "In that day shall there be upon the bells of the horses HOLINESS UNTO THE LORD," etc.

6. It is declared that the church shall come into this state

before the "battle of the great day of God Almighty," which is to precede the millennium. Rev. 19: 6—8, "And to her it was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white, *for the fine linen is the righteousness of the saints.*" What emblem can express a state of perfect moral purity, if this does not? That this is the real meaning of the sacred writer, is evident from verse 14, in which the moral purity of heaven is expressed by precisely the same emblem, "fine linen, white and clean." Here we have the actual accomplishment of the object of redemption referred to in Eph. 5: 25—27, and of the purpose of divine grace spoken of in Eph. 1: 9, 10: "The marriage of the Lamb," which is to take place on earth, "will come" when, and only when, Christ shall "present the church to himself, a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing;" but when it shall be "holy and without blemish." I conclude, then, that the Bible teaches us, that some have already attained to a state of entire sanctification in this life, and that to this glorious consummation the church is hereafter to be brought.

We are now prepared to consider the following remark of Mr. F. "It is remarkable, while he [Mr. Mahan] is contending for the doctrine of the actual attainment of perfect and permanent holiness in the present life, as the secret and spring of higher devotedness which he trusts he himself has found, it was not that doctrine, but another, which put him in possession of the secret." I observe, 1. That I have nowhere contended for the "doctrine of the actual attainment of perfect and permanent holiness in the present life, as the secret and spring of higher devotedness." The secret and spring of all attainment in holiness, I have everywhere placed in simple faith in those provisions and promises of divine grace, which render the attainment of perfect holiness in this life *practicable* to us, and practicable in the sense in which I have explained the term. 2. Every one is aware, that while an individual *theoretically* adopts one sentiment, he may, in certain circumstances, *practically* adopt precisely the opposite sentiment. Certain philosophers, for example, deny the existence of the external world, while their practical convictions are in direct opposition to their theory. A sinner who theoretically holds the doctrine of inability, practically adopts the opposite doctrine when brought under deep conviction of sin. So with myself at the time to which Mr. F. refers. The redemption of Christ was then present,

ed to my mind as a full and perfect redemption. I felt that in Christ I was "complete," that in him every demand of my being was met, and perfectly met. In this light I presented him to others. It was by subsequent reflection, however, that I became aware that the principles which I had practically adopted necessarily involved the doctrine of Christian perfection. Here permit me to express the conviction, that no man ever makes high attainments in holiness without the practical adoption, at the time, of this very doctrine, the perfect fulness of Christ's redemption. To make such attainments with the common theory distinctly before the mind ; to rise, under such circumstances, from the gloom of spiritual barrenness to the enjoyment of the life and peace which the gospel promises, is, in my judgment, a natural impossibility.

I will now notice one or two difficulties of the common theory respecting this subject, which have not been referred to in the preceding remarks, but which the advocates of that theory will be necessitated to meet before the churches.

1. They must meet the doctrine of Christian perfection upon its own merits, unencumbered with any imputed or supposed alliance with *perfectionism*, or any of the forms of fanaticism at which the church is justly alarmed.

2. All admit, that if the declarations of Scripture in respect to the provisions and promises of divine grace, are to be understood literally, they authorize us to expect entire sanctification in this life. The advocates of the common theory maintain, that we are to put a restrictive construction upon such passages. Now, when would the universally received principles of interpretation require us to put a literal construction upon promises ? In determining this question, respect should always be had to the *power*, *knowledge*, and *goodness* of the promiser. In God these are all perfect.

3. All admit that we should be under obligations infinite, to put a literal and not a restrictive construction upon "the promises," when the former construction is most favorable to holiness. Now, the literal construction of "the promises" authorizes us to pray for and aim at perfection in holiness, with the joyful expectation of obtaining it. Which construction is most favorable to fervent prayer and rigorous effort for holiness,—that which authorizes such expectation, or that which annihilates it ?

4. Another difficulty in the way of the common theory will be found in the argument in respect to the internal evidence of Christianity. The argument is this: (1.)—The absolute perfection of the moral precepts of Christianity. (2.) The perfect adaptation of its system of doctrines, etc., to secure obedience in us, to its precepts. Of one or more possible constructions of the language of inspiration, that must be admitted to be the true one which is best adapted to secure obedience to the moral precepts of Christianity, or we must give up for ever the argument for the truth of Christianity from internal evidence. Now, who will deny, that the construction for which we contend is better adapted to secure obedience than the opposite construction?

Finally, every one who understands the doctrine of Christian perfection, knows perfectly, that its truth is a perpetual want of the church. To persuade her that this doctrine is not true, is to persuade her that that gospel, which professes to meet *all* her wants, and render her "complete in Christ," is an imperfect gospel.

I notice but one other statement of Mr. F. Speaking of the "permanent and visible state to which the Christian must reach," "To this state," he says, "he will be raised, not by dwelling on any abstract notion of the actual attainment of perfect holiness in this life," but by "beholding, as in a glass, the glory of the Lord," and "being changed into the same image, from glory to glory." I reply, in conclusion of this article, by citing the following extract from the work under consideration. The design of the extract is to show the influence of *dwelling* upon the doctrine of Christian perfection. It implies three things:

"1. Deep and profound meditation upon the pure and perfect law of God, and upon the action of all the powers of our being, in all the circumstances and relations of life, in conformity with that law. By thus meditating upon the divine statutes, the Psalmist declares that he had become "wiser than his teachers." Who will dare affirm that such meditations are not in a high degree favorable to holiness? Who will affirm that, in thus meditating upon God's pure and perfect law, we shall see no bright reflections of that glory, in the beholding of which the Christian is changed into the same image?

"2. In another view of the subject, dwelling upon the

view of Christian perfection implies a devout contemplation of the character of Christ, as a full and perfect Saviour—a Saviour able and willing to meet all our real necessities. By such contemplations — contemplations in which we are brought to "know and believe the love which God hath to us"—we are informed, 1 John 4: 16, 17, that "our love is made perfect."

"3. In yet another view of the subject, dwelling upon the doctrine under consideration implies a frequent and devout contemplation of the provisions of divine grace for the entire sanctification of believers, and of the designs of God to raise them to this state, whenever they look to him by faith to do it for them. Such meditations upon God's "thoughts of good, and not of evil," towards his people, tend in the most powerful manner conceivable to melt our hearts in love and tenderness towards God, and to induce in us the most vigorous efforts after that holiness which we are required to perfect. In whatever point of light the doctrine under consideration is contemplated, dwelling upon it has one tendency, and only one—the assimilation of our entire character to that of Christ."

ARTICLE X.

Religious Liberty in France.

By an American in Paris.

1. *Projet d'Ordonnance portant réglement d'Administration pour les Eglises Réformées.*
2. *Lettre d'un Laique à un Pasteur, sur le Projet d'Ordonnance portant réglement d'Administration pour les Eglises Réformées.* (*Par Henri Lutteroth*), *Paris*, 1840.
3. *Lettre à un Pasteur sur le Projet d'Ordonnance portant réglement d'Administration pour les Eglises Réformées, par Athanase Coquerel, l'un des Pasteurs de l'Eglise Réformée de Paris.*
4. *Lettre à M. Athanase Coquerel, l'un des Pasteurs de l'Eglise Réformée de Paris, sur le Projet d'Ordonnance portant réglement d'Administration pour les Eglises Réformées*, par le Comte Agénor De Gasparin, Maitre des Requêtes au Conseil d'Etat.
5. *Lettre à M. le Comte Agénor De Gasparin, sur le Methodisme.* Par Joseph Martin-Paschoud, l'un des Pasteurs de l'Eglise Réformée de Paris.

It was our intention to give one or two articles on the History of the Protestant Religion in France, before entering on the topic which is now to receive our notice; but circumstances, which we need not state, compel us to postpone them for the present, that we may discuss a subject of vast and immediate interest to the church in that country.

To bring this subject more fully before our readers, we invite their attention to the State of Religious Liberty in France since the Revolution of 1789.

It is well known that one result of that great movement, in its earliest and best times, was to give to France the rich boon of religious freedom,—a boon which she had only partially and occasionally enjoyed, for centuries. But soon, the Revolution, so full of promise to its ardent admirers, became a tornado, sweeping away all the ancient institutions of the kingdom, and leaving bare the very foundations on which they had stood. The Roman Catholic church dominant, exclusive and persecuting, as she had long been, was soon made to feel that her day of retribution had come; and dreadful were the blows beneath which she succumbed. In her fall, she dragged down Christianity itself;

of which, in the estimation of the infuriated avengers of past injuries, she had been the true and sole representative. Religion in its widest sense was declared by statute to be annihilated.

But the storm of political fury and infidel licentiousness at length abated; and the conviction of the necessity of a religion of some kind to the existence of any civil government, began to return to the minds of all reflecting men. Even when the storm was at its acme, Robespierre saw the desolation it was working, and endeavored to mitigate its fury, by inducing the Convention, which had recently abolished religion in every form, to restore the doctrines of the existence of a Supreme Being, and of the immortality of the soul.* The reign of Atheism and the worship of Reason, which was personated as a Goddess, by a beautiful woman from the brothels of Paris, in some of the fêtes of that city, were of brief duration. Nor was that of Deism, which succeeded, much longer. It is true the theophilanthropists, aided by the funds of the government, opened some fifteen or twenty churches, hired the best singers from the opera and theatre, delivered orations and sung hymns in honor of God and the immortality of the soul; but all in vain. By the end of 1795, scarcely a vestige of Deism, as an organized form of religion, remained in France. From that epoch we may date the return of Christianity.

Here we must be allowed to say that the admirers of Napoleon have claimed much more for that great but ambitious man than he deserves. At this moment especially, when all France is intoxicated, with the idea of having his remains brought from St. Helena and deposited in the Hôtel des Invalides, no language is too extravagant to be employed in his praise.† For months the press has teemed with these laudations. The newspapers, excepting those

---

* On the 10th of October, 1793, the Convention decreed the abolition of Christianity; in place of which they established what they called the worship of Reason. On the 7th of May following, Robespierre induced the same body to proclaim the restoration of the above doctrines.

† The friends and authors of the Revolution of July, 1830, are foremost in bringing back the remains of the Emperor, and accomplishing—if we may so term it—his *apotheosis!*

in favor of the Carlist or late régime,—the *Gazette de France*, the *France*, the *Quotidienne*, and the *Univers*,—have made this event the standing subject of remark. A vast number of pamphlets, and even several volumes have been published on this subject. Every fact and circumstance which any one has known, or heard of in relation to him, has been dragged to light. Elba and St. Helena have been surveyed; and topographical charts have been published, to adorn a ten sous pamphlet in which the author,—some young man perhaps making his début,—thinks that he has said something better than has ever yet been said respecting the "Greatest Captain of twelve centuries," as Lord Holland styles him. And among all the titles bestowed upon him, none is more conspicuous than *Restorer of Religion.* To believe some of these ignorant scribblers, Napoleon Buonaparte was another Constantine. Indeed they have instituted a grave comparison between the two men, and maintained that what the latter did for Christianity in the 4th century, the former has done, and more, in the 19th.

Let us consider for a moment the claims of Napoleon to the title of *Restorer of Religion.* What are the facts in the case? During the years 1796—99, that is, from the close of the Convention to the overthrow of the Directory by Napoleon, the Christian religion, aided by legislative enactments, was gradually re-establishing itself in France.* From the

---

* One of the last acts of the Convention had reference to religious worship. It is called the law of the 7th Vendemiaire of the year IV. (29th September) 1795. The 17th Article is as follows: "The room chosen for the holding of religious worship shall be indicated and declared to the Assistant Municipal Officer, in the communes* of less than five thousand souls, and in the others, to the Municipal Administration of the Canton or Arrondissement. This declaration shall be copied into the common register of the municipality or the commune, and sent to the bureau of the correctional police of the Canton. It is forbidden to use the aforesaid room before having complied with this formality." It is remarkable, that the article immediately preceding, forbids the assembling of more than ten persons in a *private* house, besides the

* The smallest subdivisions of France, which correspond very nearly to our townships.

month Vendémiaire in 1795 to 1801—the epoch of the famous Concordat—32,214 *parishes* out of 40,000, *had demanded and received permission to re-open their churches*, and had actually opened them; whilst 4,571 were in the process of demanding the same permission. Two national councils (Catholic) were held at Paris, one in 1797, the other in 1801. The reports and other pieces which these assemblies published, display a large share of the Jansenist spirit; and it is highly probable, that if Napoleon had allowed the Roman Catholic church to go on as it began, it would have become truly the *Gallican church*, somewhat like the church of England, yielding to the Pope the honors of a simple primacy.

The Protestants, in many places, had begun to hold public worship, which they had not been allowed to do for more than a century; they relied on the voluntary principle for the support of their pastors, as their ancestors had done before the revocation of the edict of Nantes. Had Napoleon let them alone, it is probable that the state of religion among them would have been more flourishing than it is at this day. They would have re-established their Provincial and National Synods; and they would have restored their ancient confession of faith and discipline. What have they gained by the Organic Articles of the year X? We shall see.

But was not Buonaparte the author of the Concordat? We answer, he was. And by that instrument he re-organized the Roman Catholic church of France, and subjected it to the influence of the state beyond what it had ever known before. And was he not the author of the Organic Articles of 1802? He was. By these the Protestants obtained, for the first time since 1685—the epoch of the revocation of the edict of Nantes—a legalized existence, and the right to have their public worship sustained, like that of the Roman Catholics, from the national treasury. In other respects, they were put on a level with their fellow-subjects. This was doing a great deal for them; nor were they ungrateful. No equal portion of the French people

---

individuals who reside in it, for religious worship. The Convention, like all successive governments of France, seems to have had a great dread of private meetings.

adhered more faithfully to the fortunes of that great man—a fact of which he was not ignorant. But let us examine, more in detail, these two famous measures—the Concordat, and the Organic Articles relative to Protestant worship.

The Concordat* to which we have referred, was concluded at Paris between Buonaparte, as First Consul, and Pius VII., on the 26th Messidor of the year IX. (July 15th, 1801.) The ratifications were exchanged on the 23d of Fructidor, (Sept. 10th,) and it was proclaimed a law, by a decree of the legislative body, on the 18th Germinal of the year X. (April 8th, 1802.) It was made by three commissioners from each contracting party. Those appointed by Buonaparte were his brother Joseph, Cretet, a counsellor of state, and Bernier, doctor in theology, etc. Those appointed by the Pope were Cardinal Gonsalvi, Cardinal Joseph Spina, Archbishop of Corinth, and Father Caselli, theological adviser to his Holiness.

This Concordat describes, in a general manner, the relations which the church was thenceforth to sustain to the state. The most important item relates to the appointment of Archbishops and Bishops; the Pope binding himself to consecrate persons nominated by the Government. On the same 15th of July, 1801, the *Articles Organiques de la Convention du 26 Messidor* au IX.—founded on the Concordat—were adopted and decreed by the legislative body. These Articles, 77 in number, specify the duties of the clergy, their salaries and emoluments, the number of the higher clergy, etc. etc.

They divided France into 60 Bishopricks; the number of Archbishops was to be 10; the number of Bishops 50; the salaries of the former were fixed at 15,000 francs, those of the latter at 10,000. The curés, or parish priests, to be appointed by the Bishops, *with the approbation of the Government*, were divided into two classes; those in the first class to have 1,500 francs, those in the second 1,000. It is

* The word Concordat designates a convention between the Bishop of Rome, as head of the Church, and any secular government, for the settlement of *ecclesiastical* relations.—Treaties which the Pope, as a secular Prince, makes with other Princes respecting *political* matters, are not called *Concordats*.

evident from this Concordat and the 77 Organic Articles that the Government of France,—in other words, Napoleon —determined to curtail the power of the Roman Catholic church. Almost every article indicates a master dealing with a slave. Not only does the Government name the Archbishops and Bishops; but neither can the Bishop appoint to a vacant curacy, nor can the priest leave his parish without its consent. The salaries of the clergy of all ranks are cut down to a very low point; and the Roman Catholic church, which had once possessed enormous revenues, must be content with some thirty millions of francs!

Let us now see what Napoleon did for the Protestants. With the Concordat, of course, they had nothing to do. But on the same day Organic Articles were adopted in relation to their worship; and on the 18th Germinal following, (April 8th,) these were included in the proclamation of the First Consul, together with the Concordat and the Articles relating to the Catholic worship.*

There are several things in these Articles which merit some notice. Those relating to the *church of the Augsburg Confession* do not seem to have made any considerable change. In addition to local consistories, there were the *Inspections*, composed of five consistorial churches each; and the general consistories, which consisted of delegates from each Inspection. There were to be three general consistories, which might meet as often as circumstances required, *with the consent of the Government.* These general consistories were to be held, for their respective districts, at Strasburg, Mayence and Cologne.

But as to the *Reformed church*, the case was different. Here almost every thing was changed. Measures of a very restrictive character were prescribed. No provision was made for the ancient general synods. The individual churches did not retain the scriptural right of choosing their

* The Protestant denominations or churches in France are two; the *Reformed church*, which is properly speaking the French Protestant church, and the *Lutheran church*, commonly called the church of the Augsburg Confession. The latter is almost wholly confined to the six or eight departments which lie nearest to the Rhine, and are German in their language and character.

own elders; but the law directed the consistory of each church, entitled to a consistory, or body of ruling elders, (to be entitled to this, the church with its branches must be in a Protestant population of 6,000 souls,) to be chosen from those of the congregation who stood highest on the tax list! their number might not be less than six, nor more than twelve. One half of each consistory must be elected every second year. In the first election of a consistory, none could vote but the twenty-five members of the congregation who paid the greatest tax. No pastor could be settled or removed without the approbation of the Government; and the consistories alone have the power of choosing pastors;—five consistorial churches in the same neighborhood constituted the district of a synod; and these synods, when met, were to be composed of the pastor, or one of the pastors, and a lay member of each consistorial church. These are the main features of these Articles, so far as they relate to the Reformed church. As they constitute the basis on which this church still rests we give them in the subjoined note.*

Articles Organiques des Cultes Protestants. TITRE I. *Dispositions générales pour toutes les communions protestantes.*

1. Nul ne pourra exercer les fonctions du culte s'il n'est Français.

2. Les églises protestantes, ni leurs ministres, ne pourront avoir des relations avec aucune puissance ni autorité étrangère.

3. Les pasteurs et ministres des diverses communions protestantes prieront et feront prier dans la récitation de leurs offices pour la prospérité de la République Française, et pour les Consuls.

4. Aucune décision doctrinale ou dogmatique, aucun formulaire sous le titre de confession, ou sous tout autre titre, ne pourront être publiés ou devenir la matière de l'enseignement, avant que le gouvernement en ait autorisé la publication ou promulgation.

5. Aucun changement dans la discipline n'aura lieu sans la même autorization.

6. Le conseil d'Etat connaîtra de toutes les entreprises des ministres du culte et de toutes dissentions qui pourront s'élever entre ses ministres.

7. Il sera pourvu au traitement des pasteurs des églises consistoriales, bien entendu qu'on imputera sur ce traitement les biens que ces églises possèdent et le produit des oblations établies par l'usage ou par des réglements.

8. Les dispositions portées par les articles organiques du culte catholique sur la liberté des fondations et sur la nature des biens qui peuvent en être l'objet, seront communes aux églises protestantes.

9. Il y aura deux académies ou séminaires dans l'est de la France pour l'instruction des ministres de la confession d'Augsbourg.

10. Il y aura un séminaire à Genève pour l'instruction des ministres des églises réformés.

11. Les professeurs de toutes les académies ou séminaires seront nommés par le premier Consul.

It is hardly necessary to remark that the loss of a considerable portion of the territory which France had then obtained by conquest, has made some change in these Articles. Two Academies or Theological Seminaries are assigned to

12. Nul ne pourra être élu, ministre ou pasteur d'une église de la confession d'Augsbourg s'il n'a étudié pendant un temps déterminé dans un des séminaires français, destiné à l'instruction des ministres de cette confession, et s'il ne rapporte un certificat en bonne forme, constatant son temps d'étude, sa capacité et ses bonnes moeurs.

13. On ne pourra être élu ministre ou pasteur d'une église réformée sans avoir étudié dans le séminaire de Genève, et si on ne rapporte un certificat dans la forme annoncée dans l'article précédent.

14. Les réglements sur l'administration et la police intérieure des séminaires sur le nombre et la qualité des professeurs, sur la manière d'enseigner et sur les objets d'enseignement, ainsi que sur la forme des certificats ou attestations d'étude, de bonne conduite et de capacité, seront approuvés par le Gouvernement.

Titre II. *Des églises réformées.* Section I. *De l'organisation générale de ces églises.*

15. Les églises réformés de France auront des pasteurs, des consistoires locaux et des synodes.

16. Il y aura une église consistoriale par six mille ames de la même communion.

17. Cinq églises consistoriales formeront l'arrondissement d'un Synode.

Section II. *Des pasteurs et des consistoires locaux.*

18. Le consistoire de chaque église sera composé du pasteur ou des pasteurs desservant cette église, et d'anciens ou notables laïques, choisis parmi les citoyens les plus imposés au rôle des contributions directes; le nombre de ces notables ne pourra être au dessous de six ni au dessus de douze.

19. Le nombre des ministres ou pasteurs dans une même église consistoriale ne pourra être augmenté sans l'autorisation du Gouvernement.

20. Les consistoires veilleront au maintien de la discipline, à l'administration des biens de l'église, et à celle des deniers provenant des aumônes.

21. Les assemblées des consistoires seront présidées par le pasteur, ou par le plus ancien des pasteurs. Un des anciens ou notables remplira les fonctions de Secrétaire.

22 Les assemblées ordinaires des consistoires continueront de se tenir aux jours marqués par l'usage.

Les assemblées extraordinaires ne pourront avoir lieu sans la permission du sous-préfet, ou du maire en absence du sous-préfet.

23. Tous les deux ans les anciens du consistoire seront renouvellés par moitié; à cette époque, les anciens en exercice s'adjoindront un nombre égal de citoyens protestants, chefs de famille, et choisis parmi les plus imposés au rôle des contributions directes de la commune, où l'église consistoriale sera située pour procéder au renouvellement. Les anciens sortans pourront être reélus.

24 Dans les églises où il n'y a point de consistoire actuel, il en sera formé un; tous les membres seront élus par la réunion des 25 chefs de famille protestants les plus imposés au rôle des contributions directes. Cette réunion n'aura lieu qu'avec l'autorisation et en la présence du préfet ou du sous-préfet.

25. Les pasteurs ne pourront être destitués qu'a la charge de presénter

the church of the Augsburg Confession in which to train up their young men for the ministry. One of these was situated in a territory which now belongs to Prussia, Nassau, etc. The other, at Strasburg, is the only one that remains

---

les motifs de la destitution au Gouvernement, que les approuvera ou les rejetera.

26. En cas de décès, ou de demission volontaire, ou de destitution confirmée d'un pasteur, le consistoire formé de la manière prescrite par l'article 18, choisira, à la pluralité des voix pour le remplacer.

Le titre d'élection sera présenté au premier Consul par le conseiller d'Etat chargé de toutes les affaires concernant les cultes, pour avoir son approbation.

L'approbation donnée, il ne pourra exercer qu'après avoir preté entre les mains du préfet le serment exigé des ministres du culte catholique.

27. Tous les pasteurs, actuellement en exercice sont provisoirement confirmés.

28. Aucune église ne pourra s'étendre d'un departement dans un autre.

SECTION III. *Des Synodes.*

29. Chaque synode sera formé du pasteur, ou d'un des pasteurs, et d'un ancien ou notable de chaque église.

30. Les Synodes veilleront sur tout ce qui concerne la célébration du culte, l'enseignement de la doctrine, et la conduite des affaires ecclésiastiques. Toutes les décisions qui émaneront d'eux, de quelque nature qu'elles soient, seront soumises à l'approbation du Gouvernement.

31. Les synodes ne pourront s'assembler que lorsqu'on en aura rapporté la permission du Gouvernement.

On donnera connaisance préalable au conseiller d'Etat chargé de toutes les affaires concernant les cultes, des matières qui devront y être traitées. L'assemblée sera tenue en présence du préfet ou du sous-préfet, et une expédition du procés-verbal des délibérations sera adressée, par le préfet, au conseiller d'Etat chargé de toutes les affaires concernant les cultes, qui, dans le plus délai en fera son rapport au Gouvernement.

32. L'assemblée d'un Synode ne pourra durer que six jours.

TITRE III. *De l'organisaeion des églises de la confession d'Augsbourg.*

SECTION I. *Dispositions générales.*

33. Les églises de la confession d'Augsbourg auront des pasteurs, des consistoires locaux, des inspections et des consistoires generaux.

SECTION II. *Des ministres ou pasteurs, et des consistoires locaux de chaque église.*

34. On suivra relativement aux pasteurs, à la circonscription, et au régime des églises consistoriales ce qui a été prescrit par la section seconde du titre précédent, pour les pasteurs et pour les églises réformées.

SECTION III. *Des Inspections.*

35. Les églises de la confession d'Augsbourg seront subordonnées a des inspections.

36. Cinq églises consistoriales formeront l'arrondissement d'une inspection.

37. Chaque inspection sera composée du ministre et d'un ancien, ou notable, de chaque église de l'arrondissement; elle ne pourra s'assembler que lorsqu'on en aura rapporté la permission du Gouvernement. La pre-

to the Lutheran church. The reader will also observe that Geneva is no longer within the limits of France. The Reformed church has, therefore, no Theological Seminary or Academy in that city; but it has one at Montauban—an ancient and very pleasant city of some 25,000 inhabitants, in the south of France—where between 60 and 70 young

---

mière fois qu'il écherra de la convoquer, elle le sera par le plus ancien des ministres desservant les églises de l'arrondissement. Chaque inspection choisira dans son sein deux laïques et un ecclésiastique, qui prendra le titre d'inspecteur, et qui sera chargé de veiller sur les ministres, et sur le maintien du bon ordre dans les églises particulières.

Le choix de l'inspecteur et des deux laïques sera confirmé par le 1ier. Consul.

38. L'inspection ne pourra s'assembler qu'avec l'autorisation du Gouvernement en présence du préfet, ou du sous-préfet, et aprés avoir donné connaissance préalable au conseiller d'Etat chargé de toutes les affaires concernant les cultes, des matières que l'on se proposera d'y traiter.

39 L'inspecteur pourra visiter les églises de son arrondissement; il s'adjoindra les deux laïques nommés avec lui, toutes les fois que les circonstances l'exigeront; il sera chargé de la convocation de l'assemblée générale de l'inspection. Aucune décision émanée de l'assemblée générale de l'inspection ne pourra être exécutée sans avoir été soumise a l'approbation du Gouvernement.

Section IV. *Des Consistoires généraux.*

40 Il y aura trois consistoires généraux; l'un a Strasbourg pour les Protestans de la confession d'Augsbourg, des départements du Haut et du Bas Rhin; l'autre à Mayence, pour ceux des départements de la Sarre et du Mont Tonnerre; et le troisième à Cologne, pour ceux des départements de Rhin-et-Moselle et de la Roër.

41 Chaque consistoire sera composé d'un président laïque protestant, de deux ecclésiastiques inspecteurs, et d'un député de chaque inspection. Le président et les deux ecclésiastiques inspecteurs seront nommés par le premier Consul.

Le président sera tenu de prêter entre les mains du premier Consul, ou du fonctionnaire public qu'il plaira au premier Consul de déléguer à cet effet, le serment exigé des ministres du culte catholique.

Les deux ecclésiastiques inspecteurs et les membres laïques prêteront le même serment entre les mains du président.

42. Le consistoire-général ne pourra s'assembler que lorsqu'on en aura rapporté la permission du Gouvernement, et qu'en présence du préfet ou du sous-préfet. On donnera préalablement connaissance au conseiller d'Etat chargé de toutes les affaires concernant les cultes, des matières qui devront y être traités. L'assemblée ne pourra durer plus de six jours.

43. Dans le temps intermédiaire d'une assemblée à l'autre, il y aura un directoire composé du président, du plus agé des deux ecclésiastiques inspecteurs et de trois laïques, dont un sera nommé par le premier Consul; les deux autres seront choisis par le consistoire général.

44. Les attributions du consistoire général et du directoire continueront d'être régies par les règlemens et coutumes des églises de la confession d'Augsbourg, dans toutes les choses auxquelles il n'a point été formellement dérogé par les lois de la République et par les présens articles.

men are preparing for the ministry, under the instruction of six professors, a majority of whom are decidedly orthodox.

Our readers can now form some estimate of the services, which Napoleon rendered to the cause of religion, and his claim to be called the *Restorer of Religion*. For every favor which he conferred on religion, or in other words, on the church, he expected a full equivalent. Nor was he mistaken in his calculations. He found it very convenient to have some thirty or forty thousand men of influence, scattered throughout the empire, who were dependent on his condescending patronage. But if he was the restorer of religion to France, most certain it is that he did not yield his own heart to its power. To his dying hour, he uttered nothing which indicated any saving knowledge of the gospel. We account as nothing the half pronounced name of the Saviour which fell from his lips occasionally at the close of life. In his last moments, his thoughts were on the grand army, and the victorious charge. And what were the thirty millions of francs, which he deigned to allow annually to the church, in comparison with the manifold larger sums which he bestowed upon his family? Kingdoms were hardly enough for his brothers.

But we proceed to notice some of the enactments of the Imperial Government which had a bearing on Religious Liberty, and particularly the Protestant worship. It is hardly necessary to remark, that the Organic Laws would not give entire satisfaction to Catholics or Protestants. Indeed with the Pope, Buonaparte had an almost unceasing war both as First Consul and as Emperor. One of the most fruitful subjects of dispute was the appointment of Archbishops and Bishops. By the Concordat made between Francis I. and Leo X. (1516,) the King was required to nominate a candidate within six months after a vacancy occurred, and within three months after a refusal by the Pope to give "institution" to the person nominated. If he failed to do so the Pope might appoint to the vacancy without the consent of the Sovereign. The same thing was implied in the Concordat of the 18th Germinal of the year X. But it is easy to see that the Pope, by his reserved power, could effectually prevent the Civil Government from making any appointment. On the right of appointing, *in*

reality, whatever the arrangement might be, the Pope has ever been inflexible. To him belongs the right of "institution," it is conceded, in all cases except those which are extraordinary; and by refusing this whenever he pleases, he in the end achieves his wishes. Buonaparte soon found this to be so in practice; and all his attempts to move the Holy Father were in vain. Neither persuasion, nor menace, was of any avail. The Pope saw his dominions overrun by the troops of the Emperor, himself dragged a prisoner, first to Savona and afterwards to Fontainebleau; yet nothing could move him. Nor did the Emperor succeed in making any arrangement with him till February, 1813, when appeared the Concordat of Fontainebleau; by the 4th Article of which, in case of the Pope's refusal to give "institution," within six months, to the Emperor's candidate, the Metropolitan, or the oldest Bishop of the province should confer consecration. But this Concordat was of no avail, except for the few months which remained of Buonaparte's reign.

As to the Protestants, whatever dissatisfaction they may have felt with a change—intended to annihilate, or rather render impracticable their ancient discipline—they bore it with as good a grace as they could, not ungrateful for their existence as a church, sanctioned as it was by the solemn forms of fundamental law. They felt and acknowledged that Napoleon had done them much good. But some laws were made whose application the Protestants have, to this day, felt to be very oppressive. A brief notice of these will close our remarks on the period of the Empire.

The most important of these laws are in the Penal Code, adopted in 1810, Articles 291 and 294. They are as follows:

"291. No association of more than twenty persons, whose object shall be to meet every day, or on certain fixed days, for religious, literary, political or other objects, shall be formed, but with the consent of the Government, and under such conditions, as it may please the public authority to impose," etc.

"294. Every individual who, without permission from the municipal authority, shall have granted or permitted the use of his house or of his apartment, in whole or in part, for the meeting of the members of an association, even authori-

zed, or for the performance of religious worship, shall be punished in a fine of from 16 to 200 francs."

Our readers, by referring to the law of 7th Vendémiaire of the year IV. (p. 431, note,) will perceive that the Convention, in Art. 17, granted full permission to hold *public* meetings for worship; though Art. 16 was designed to restrain private meetings for worship, by limiting the number of persons to ten besides the occupants of the house. A grave question arose, on the adoption of this Code, as to the effect of Arts. 291 and 294 on Art. 17th of the law of 7th Vendémiaire. On this subject three opinions have been entertained.—1. The law of 7th Vendémiaire has been abrogated by the Code, which still exists in full force. This is the judgment of the Court of Cassation, the highest law tribunal in the realm. 2. The law of 7th Vendémiaire is not entirely abrogated by the Code; the two are perfectly consistent; the latter refers to secret associations—political and religious clubs—whilst the former recognises and establishes the *absolute right of the multitude* to assemble for religious as well as political purposes.* 3. Whatever may have been the fate of the law of 7th Vendémiaire during the Empire, the Charter, which requires no previous authorization for religious meetings in any circumstances, has abrogated Arts. 291 and 294, of the Code. This was the decision of the Royal Court of Rennes, Aug. 1, 1828; and also of the Royal Court of Orleans in the affair of Montargis, of which we shall speak more fully in another place.

It must now be evident to every one, that it was the object of Napoleon, to subject as completely as possible the church to the state, according to the Concordat and the Organic Laws. The Government nominates the Archbishops, Bishops—and even the curés; for the choice of the Bishops must fall on those to whose appointment it is willing to accede;† it reserves the right to determine the number of priests;‡ it imposes on them articles of faith; it regulates every thing—religious festivals, prayers, preaching, liturgy,

* Paroles de M. Berlier; *Exposé des motifs du Code pénal de* 1810, liv. 3. lit. 1, p. 99.

† Conc. Arts. 4 and 10.

‡ Law of 18th Germ. Art. 26.

catechism, limits of districts, charge of bishops, dress of ecclesiastics, etc. etc.* After regulating the government of the church, it occupied itself with the government of the parishes and rules of ecclesiastical administration.† It left the church mistress of no detail—its will was felt everywhere and supreme everywhere, within and without.—Next the Protestants became the objects of its solicitude. Nor was the yoke lighter upon their necks. To be valid, the election of pastors must be confirmed by the Government. ‡ Consistories, Synods, Inspections could not assemble without permission.§ It must determine the number of pastors ;‖ and finally, nothing could be decided, nothing taught, nothing changed, excepting by its order.¶ Even the Jews did not escape. The electors of the Rabbis and Grand Rabbis must be designated and approved by the Government. It fixed the number of the synagogues, mode of defraying the expense, and the functions of the consistories, etc. etc. **

We have now reviewed the period of the Consulate and the Empire, during which the state governed the church with a strong hand. We now come to a period of nearly the same length, during which the church endeavored to govern the state. In 1814 the Bourbons returned to France ; but their tottering throne was not established till the battle of Waterloo in 1815. From that time to 1830, the era of the Restoration, the Roman Catholics endeavored, by every possible means, to recover their former ascendency and bring back the golden age of Louis XIV. Though aided by two powerful auxiliaries, Louis XVIII. and Charles X., their attempts were to a great degree in vain. The spirit of the nation was not favorable to their

---

* Law of 18th Germ., Arts. 39, 40, 41, 42, 50, 53, 60, and Conc. Art. 2.

† Decrees of Dec. 30, 1809, and Nov. 6, 1813.

‡ Organic Art. 26.

§ The same, 22, 31, 38.

‖ The same, 19.

¶ The same, 4, 5, 14, 30, 39.

** Régl. Dec. 10, 1806, rendered effective March 17, 1808, Arts. 8, 9, 16.

object. There remained too vivid a recollection of their former domination, and withal, it must be added, too much indifference to all religion. The Charter, granted by Louis XVIII. at the time he ascended the throne, though far from possessing the clearness and definiteness which ought to characterize such an instrument, was also an obstacle in the way of the *ultramontanists*, as the advocates of the claims of Rome were denominated. The language of Art. 5 is as follows:

"Every one shall profess his religion with a perfect equality, and obtain for his worship the same protection."* This, though somewhat vague, must be supposed to grant to every citizen, not only the right to his own internal conviction and belief—a right inherent and unalienable, over which no human government has any jurisdiction—but also that of engaging in such public acts of worship as he may deem edifying to himself, and as may show the world the doctrines which he holds, and the discipline to which he adheres. But the bigoted advocates of Romanism endeavored to nullify this Article, by opposing to it Art. 6 of the same instrument, which declares that "the Catholic religion is the religion of the state;"† the meaning of which is, that, as the great majority of the nation received the Roman Catholic faith, that shall be considered emphatically the religion of France. It was intended without doubt, but not wisely, to sooth the feelings of the Catholics, and reconcile them to the perfect toleration granted in the preceding Article.

In 1817, (June 11th,) Louis XVIII.—influenced by the priests, and his own devotion to the interests of Rome—concluded a Concordat with the Pope; which abrogated the one made with Napoleon, and the Organic Articles founded thereon, and restored the Episcopal sees. This instrument excited much alarm among the friends of religious liberty in France; especially Art. 10, in which the monarch engaged to employ, in concert with the Holy Father, all the means in his power to remove the obstacles which oppose religion, and hinder the execution of the laws of the church. What

* "Chacun professe sa religion avec une égale liberté, et obtient pour son culte la même protection."

† "Cependant la religion Catholique est la religion de l'Etat."

more could Francis I. have promised? It was the recognition of a principle wholly at variance with Art. 5 of the Charter, and implied a determination to accomplish its abrogation.

Fortunately, this Concordat must be submitted to the Chambers. But this, the Government dared not do. To such a degree was the public opposition excited, that the Ministers presented, instead of it, a law embracing some provisions of this Concordat, but containing others to secure the state against the encroachments of the Popes. Even this, the Government was forced to withdraw, leaving the new Concordat inoperative as to all those provisions which required the approbation of the Chambers, and leaving the Organic Articles in full force.

It is true that some of the provisions of this Concordat of 1817 were afterwards approved by the Chambers;—and also Arts. 4 and 8 of the Concordat itself, relating to the endowment of certain Bishopricks. Thus there exists to this day, this strange anomaly;—the Concordat of July 15th, 1801, is abolished, but the Organic Law founded thereon is still in force; on the contrary, portions of the Concordat of June 11th, 1817—the only one recognised at Rome—have no Organic Articles.

The Restoration did not materially affect the Protestants; but the same relations, in the main, which Napoleon had established, continued to subsist between them and the state. It is true that in the south of France, particularly in the department of the Gard, and the neighborhood of Nimes, there were some troubles in 1816—19, and even violent persecution. Many Protestants fell victims to the revived hatred and murderous attacks of the Roman Catholics. But these tumults were not general, nor of long continuance. They were condemned by the most sensible Catholics throughout the kingdom. No one, perhaps, regretted their occurrence more than Louis himself; who, although a decided Catholic, and even a bigot in some respects, was habitually influenced by a sense of justice and feelings of humanity, to which his brother, Charles X. was an utter stranger. During the Restoration the laws forbidding the assembling of more than twenty persons for religious purposes, without permission, were strictly enforced. It was during that dark period that several of the

Religious and Benevolent Societies, which are now doing so much good, took their origin. But their first movements were necessarily restricted, hesitating and cautious. We have sometimes thought that they then received an impress, which has too long characterized their efforts.

At length the Revolution of July 1830 came. It was fondly hoped that this event would mark a new era of Religious Liberty. But these hopes, we think, have not been realized. That France has gained much by the late Revolution, in many respects, cannot be denied. The liberty of the press is established on a firm basis. The Government has done and is still doing much for the education of the people, and for the promotion of every *material* interest. Railroads, Steamboats, and the most approved machinery are becoming more and more known and appreciated. The fine arts are also greatly encouraged. And in no other country are men of learning so much employed by the government, with a view, not only of rendering them serviceable to itself, but also of affording them the opportunity of devoting their leisure, to their favorite studies. The great Institute, with its five Academies, is well sustained ; and the science of the largest body of associated literati in the world, is rendered eminently available, by their being consulted by the Government, whenever their superior knowledge can give the information needed. All this is well. It shows that France is governed by a man of sense and of enlarged views. Indeed, we have no hesitation in saying, that of all living monarchs, Louis Philippe is by far the most able and learned. He is also a man of humane feelings, a lover of peace, and as habitually governed by a sense of justice probably, as we can expect any one to be, amid circumstances so full of temptation. We believe that his desire is to do what is just and impartial. And, without doubt, he is the best sovereign France has ever had. Comparing his private character, as well as his public acts, even with those of Henry IV., we are inclined to think that he merits the name of *Great*, more than the latter. Still we are convinced, that the government of Louis Philippe has not been such us was reasonably expected by Protestants; or indeed, by the enlightened and sincere friends of religious liberty of every name. It is in relation to this question, that its most serious faults have been committed.

The Revolution of July 1830 gave to France a new Constitution, or rather an improved one; for the Charter of that date is only the one of June 1814 remodelled. But there is this broad difference between the two; that of 1830 was made by the people through their representatives, and is a compact between them and their sovereign, which he is bound, by oath, to observe and obey; whilst that of 1814 was a *donum regium*, a royal gift, and as such, whatever jurisconsults may say to the contrary, never could have had, in the royal mind at least, the same heart-felt pledge for its faithful observance. The Charter of 1830 contains the same provisions in relation to religious rights, as that of 1814. Art. 5 is in these words: "*Every individual is free to profess his religion with equal liberty, and shall obtain for his worship equal protection.*" This broad declaration was regarded by Protestants, with the same feelings, as was the Edict of Nantes by their ancestors. In fact, it is their shield and hope, and it ought to secure to them all they desire. But true religious liberty is comprehended by very few persons in France.

At first, no special opposition was made by the civil authorities, to the efforts which the Protestants put forth to promote the knowledge of the gospel. There were indeed some cases of vexations interference, but nothing occurred which merits our special notice till 1834; when the Government, through the Minister of Justice and Keeper of the Great Seal, M. Persil, introduced into the Chambers a law on the subject of Associations, which excited not a little solicitude. The three Articles which were considered the most dangerous, were as follows. "Art. 1. The provisions of Art. 291 of the Penal Code are applicable to associations of more than twenty persons, even when these associations may be divided into sections of a less number, and when they may not meet every day, nor on fixed days. The authorization, given by the Government, is always revocable. "Art. 2. Whoever forms part of an association, not authorized, shall be punished with two months' imprisonment, and a fine of from 50 to 1,000 francs. In case of a repetition, these punishments shall be doubled. The condemned person shall, in this case, be placed under the surveillance of the police for a period, which shall not exceed the double of the maximum of that of his punish-

ment." "Art. 3. Those who shall have knowingly lent or rented their houses or apartments, for one or more meetings of an association not authorized, shall be considered accomplices, and punished as such."

The history of this law is interesting and important. It was adopted, or rather, we believe, it received the royal sanction, April 20th, 1834, and bears, consequently, that date. Before its adoption, two amendments were proposed by Messrs. Roger and Dubois, *to except associations for the performance of religious worship.* These amendments, after an address from the Keeper of the Great Seal, were declared to be useless. M. Persil expressed himself in these words: "With reference to meetings, which have for their object the worship which is rendered to the Deity, and the performance of that worship, the law is not applicable;—we formally declare this." On the preceding day he had said, that the law proposed was nothing more nor less than Art. 291 of the Penal Code; except as it applied to the periodicalness of the meetings, and the division of the members.* And when the subject was discussed in the Chamber of Peers, the reporter of the law—who may or may not be the chairman of the committee to whom any proposed measure has been referred—quoted the declaration of M. Persil, just given, and added: "If this declaration is not in the law itself, it forms at least the official and inseparable commentary. It is under this assurance that the Article has been passed in the other Chamber, and will be passed by you; and there is no reason to fear that any tribunal in France will refuse thus to understand it."†

We have in the above history, a specimen of the loose manner in which the Chambers make their laws. Unaccustomed to long and patient legislation, the French act in this matter, as in almost every thing else, too much by impulse. The declaration of the Minister of Justice is the inseparable commentary of the law! It ought to have been *in* the law. And what has been the result? The law had been in force hardly a single year, before it was applied to religious assemblies held by colporteurs, evangelists and ordained ministers. And what became of M. Persil's *com-*

---

* Moniteur March 21, 1834. † Moniteur April 6, 1834.

mentary? When the magistrates were reminded, or informed rather of its existence in the *Moniteur*, a shrug of the shoulders—such as a Frenchman only can make—was the first response, and then: "Mais, messieurs, voilà la loi!"

Passing by minor cases, we shall mention two which will show, better than any thing else, what measures have been taken to destroy that religious liberty which, it was vainly believed, the Charter of 1830 had secured.

The first is that of the Rev. M. Oster who attempted to labor for the spiritual benefit of the Jews in Metz—a city in the north eastern part of the kingdom—in the year 1836. He is a minister in the church of the Augsburg confession, which is recognised by the Charter as one of the established churches. No objection can be advanced against his character, as a Christian, or a minister. He is a faithful man, and has labored much for the conversion of the Jews—"his kindred," if we mistake not, "according to the flesh."

Going to Metz in the winter of 1835—36, and finding no Protestant temples, he hired a house in which to hold meetings for such as chose to come and hear him, and gave notice to the magistrates in conformity with the law of 7th Vendémiaire of the year IV. After continuing his meetings for one month in peace, he was informed by the Mayor that *these meetings must not be held without the permission of the civil authorities*, and he was good enough to add, *that this permission if asked, would be refused!* M. Oster was next prosecuted before the court of *Première Instance* of Metz, and acquitted. Then he was tried, by appeal, before the Royal Court of that city and condemned, Feb. 10th, 1836. The ground of his condemnation was, his having violated the Arts. 291 and 294 of the Penal Code, which the Court maintained to be still in force, notwithstanding their manifest opposition to the Charter. From this decision, M. Oster appealed directly to the Court of Cassation, which dismissed the appeal, and thus sustained the decision of the Court of Metz.

This important cause was argued by M. Nachet in behalf of the appellant, and by M. Dupin the Attorney General (*Procureur du Roi*) in defence of the judgment below. M. Nachet, in his memorial to the Court setting forth the case, and in his address, discussed the question with singular

ability.* We do not recollect ever to have read a clearer demonstration than his of the following positions. 1. The Charter, Art. 5, grants and establishes religious *liberty*, and not *toleration* merely. 2. The liberty of worship granted by the Charter is not to be limited to the communions or churches sustained by the national treasury, or in other words, the established churches. 3. The liberty of worship, granted by the Charter, is liberty, not only of *thought* but of *action*—and this action, not isolated, but associated—and implies the right of assembling together. 4. Art. 291 of the Code which interdicts the assembling of more than twenty persons, without the consent of the Government, is incompatible with this liberty; since liberty ceases to exist when it has no other guaranty than the will of power. The authorization, demanded by the Code, can never be refused—in which case it is nothing more than a simple declaration,—or, it may be refused, as the words express, whenever the Government thinks proper, and then the liberty of the subject is merged in the good pleasure of the sovereign. But constitutional government is a government of guaranties—a government which substitutes the fixed, certain, universal will of law, for the changing, partial will of the prince. 5. The right of assembling for religious worship implies the right of meeting in a *place;* hence Art. 294 of the Code, which obliges the proprietor to obtain permission of the government for opening his house, infringes the Charter, and is therefore null and void.

The clear and powerful argument of M. Nachet was heard with profound attention. M. Dupin, in his reply, as he had done on a former occasion, paid to M. N. the highest compliment. He conceded almosts every position which had been taken. He admitted, that the Government had no right to interdict the assembling of any number of persons for religious worship; thus abandoning Art. 291 of the Code. But he maintained the validity of Art. 294 as a *police* regulation. He contended that the Government, by its municipal agents, ought to have cogni-

* M. Nachet is the author of an excellent work entitled: *De la Liberté Religieuse en France, ou Essai sur la Législation relative à l'exercise de cette Liberté*, Par J. Nachet, Avocat à la Cour Royale de Paris. Ouvrage couronné par la Société de la Morale Chrétienne.

sance of places of worship, with the right of deciding upon their *convenience, salubrity, time of meeting, conduct* of the persons assembled, etc., and that a refusal might and ought to be given if the place were *unwholesome, unsafe, dark, subterranean,* if the *hours were improper,* and if *immoralities, tumults or other disorders* should occur. He admitted that a refusal for any reasons, except those of police, would be wrong; and that redress should be sought by application to the Prefect of the Department, to the Minister of Public Worship, to the Council of State in certain cases, and finally, to the Legislative Chambers. But he denied that redress could be obtained through the tribunals; it must be sought by ways administrative or legislative, and not judicial. At the same time, he spoke in the most unqualified terms of reprobation of the conduct of the Mayor.* He said that the reasons assigned were "*bad, deplorable, inexplicable for the times in which we live; the decision ought to be reversed, and if I believed the judicial authority to be competent, I should not hesitate to demand through this tribunal its annulment.*"

The Court of Cassation decided in perfect accordance with the spirit of M. Dupin's views. But the effect was to terminate M. Oster's labors at Metz. He has found that it is not so easy to obtain redress by *administrative* and *legislative* ways, or any other, as M. Dupin seemed to imagine. Nor has his experience been singular, or his case solitary.

We come now to a more notorious case of injustice in the application of Arts. 291 and 294 of the Code in connexion with the law of April 20th, 1834. In 1837 the Evangelical Society of France employed two of its agents in the neighborhood of Montargis, an ancient and small city in the central part of the kingdom, lying some leagues to the east of Orleans. One of these was a M. Doine; a young man who was licensed by the pastor of the church at Montargis, or some other place, to exhort and explain the Scriptures,—a practice which is consistent with the ancient discipline of the Reformed church of France. Persons thus

* The Mayor had refused permission to M. Oster to use his house, simply because his writings had excited the Jews of the city. M. O. has written several tracts against the Jewish doctrines.

set apart, and steadily occupied in holding meetings and explaining the Scriptures are called evangelists.* To some of his meetings, M. Doine was accompanied by M. Lemaire, a pious schoolmaster, then engaged in teaching one of the Society's schools at Montargis. In October they, with a M. Courapied, were arrested, tried and condemned ;—Doine, for holding a meeting of more than 20 persons without permission, Lemaire, for assisting—although he took no part, more than any one else who attended—and Courapied, for once opening his house. Doine was mulcted in 100 francs, Lemaire and Courapied in 16 each; and the costs of the trial were levied on the three together. The trial occurred Oct. 10th, before the *tribunal of correctional police* of Montargis. There was something peculiarly malevolent in this decision ; for Messrs. Doine and Lemaire were condemned for holding several meetings without permission ; whereas they had held but one such meeting ; and then only because the Mayor of the commune was absent, and they were assured by the people that there would be no difficulty. As to another meeting, held in an adjoining commune, for which they were condemned, it was proved that permission had been obtained from the assistant Mayor. From this decision Messrs. Doine and Lemaire appealed to the Royal Court of Orleans.

Before that Court the second trial commenced, Jan. 6th, and terminated Jan. 9th, 1838. The accused were defended by Messrs. Lutteroth and Lafontaine, whose arguments are given in full in the published account of this important trial. They contain a luminous and powerful appeal in behalf of the dearest rights of Protestants; and they are exceedingly instructive, on account of the many historical facts which are introduced. M. Lutteroth is a distinguished layman of Paris—of wealth and education—and a most active member of the committee of the Evangelical Society,

---

* This practice of employing laymen to read and expound the Scriptures in certain exigencies, as in the absence or sickness of the pastor, in places remote from any Protestant church—is both ancient and modern. It has arisen from necessity. Nothing is more common than for the minister, when called to the performance of a distant service, to depute some capable layman to take his place.

and other benevolent associations. M. Lafontaine is a lawyer of eminence.

After three hours deliberation, the Court—consisting of seven judges, none of them Protestants, we believe—through the President, M. Vilneau, discharged the appellants from the sentence and the accusation of the tribunal below. We give the material points in this decision, because of its great importance, and because of the clear view it takes of the subject.

The Charter, the Court say, "has not had for its object to protect only the liberty of opinion and belief, which, shut up in the impenetrable sanctuary of the conscience, escapes from the dominion of human laws; but to assure well the free manifestation of this belief, by words or external acts—that is to say, by the performance of certain practices or ceremonies. Religious liberty, indeed, like all our political liberties, is submitted to the necessities of social order; for the purpose even of its conservation, this liberty has need of the surveillance of the temporal authority; but that surveillance, intended to repress the abuse of right, ought not to impede, nor, above all, prevent its exercise. Hence by the law of the 7th Vendémiaire a previous declaration must be made to the civil authorities, that they may adopt those measures of police and safety which they may deem necessary."

"The Penal Code of 1810, carrying this requirement still further in Arts. 291 and 294, has, it is true, rendered the existence of associations, whose intention is to occupy themselves with religious matters, subject to the *consent* of the Government; but these restrictive enactments are irreconcilable with the right, clearly understood, *of professing freely one's religion.* In effect, to admit, in this case, the necessity for the citizens to ask the *consent* of the Government, would be to recognise in it the power to *refuse*, and by consequence, render illusory one of the most precious rights of man. The necessary consequence of the incompatibility between Art. 5 of the Social Pact (the Charter) and Art. 291 etc. of the Penal Code, is, conformably to the Art. 70 of the Charter, the virtual abrogation of the last mentioned enactments, in all that relates to the performance of religious worship."

"It is vainly desired to apply to this cause the law of

April 10th, 1834. In effect, that law was only intended to prohibit associations, properly so called, resulting from an agreement between the persons associated, and whose object or pretext might be to occupy themselves with theories or religious controversies; but it was evidently not intended to touch the simple assembling of individuals, united by the same Religious sentiment and for the performance of religious worship. This interpretation results from the discussion in the legislative body, particularly from the formal declaration of the Minister of Religion—a declaration which led to the rejection of the amendments proposed as superfluous and useless."

Many Protestants had attended this trial, deeply interested in its successive proceedings. At its close, as soon as the judges had retired, the pastors who had heard the judgment of the Court, weeping from joy and gratitude, rushed into each other's arms. The emotion was general; neither Catholics nor Protestants could restrain their feelings.—The next day, a deputation of the pastors and elders waited on M. Lafontaine, to express to him their gratitude for his zeal in defence of religious liberty. A solemn thanks giving service was held in the temple at Orleans. The promises of the Lord to those who should be brought before civil tribunals, (Mat. 10: 16—20,) the intervention of Gamaliel in favor of the Apostles, the precepts of Paul on the duties of Christians to magistrates, (Rom. 13,) and David's song of thanksgiving, (Ps. 95: 1—7,) were read; and hymns were sung expressing confidence, gratitude and joy. The impression left on the heart was sweet, solemn and edifying.

From this decision, the Procureur Général of the Royal Court of Orleans appealed to the Court of Cassation. The trial before that Court continued from April 7, to April 12, 1838. M. Bresson, a counsellor, made a report on the memorial of the case, which had been prepared and published by Count Julius Delaborde—advocate for Messrs. Doine and Lemaire—and on the argument of the Procureur Général of the Royal Court of Orleans. After this, the court was addressed at length by M. Delaborde in behalf of the accused, and by M. Dupin, in behalf of the State. A large concourse of persons attended the trial,

Lord Brougham, who had arrived from England the night before, was present during the whole of it.*

The arguments of Messrs. Delaborde and Dupin, which unquestionably display great ability, have been written out and published, together with the memorial of the former, in a volume which constitutes the sequel to the trial at Orleans. But M. Dupin, we are sorry to say, greatly disappointed the friends of religious liberty. For many years—though nominally, and for aught we know, from conviction, a Roman Catholic—he had distinguished himself as the advocate of the chartered rights of the Protestants. In the affair of Poizot, he demonstrated the absurdity of granting liberty of worship in theory, and denying the means of enjoying it. His address before the Court of Cassation, in the case of M. Oster, was remarkably candid and just. But on the present occasion, with his great powers, and his almost boundless resources of legal knowledge, he stooped to play the part of a special pleader and obsequious sycophant.

The strongest argument of M. Dupin, and that on which he laid great stress, in favor of governmental interference with religious worship, was, that without this right, Paganism, and even the mysteries of Isis, might be introduced; and that, in no other way could immoralities be prevented in meetings held professedly for religious purposes. He held up the case of the St. Simonians, and the Jesuits—that sword whose handle is in Rome, but whose point is everywhere. But the answer to all this is exceedingly simple. There is not a Protestant in France, who would object to the closing of meetings held professedly for religious worship, but in reality, for political objects or immoral practices. It was on this ground, that the Government chased away the St. Simonians. They were propagating doctrines which, like those of Owen and the Socialists in England, and Frances Wright and others in America, were subversive of society. As to the Jesuits, they were suppressed during M. Casimir Perrier's administration, in 1832, because they were secretly laboring to overthrow the Government. But the Protestants desire to worship, and edify each other in *pub-*

* He took his seat beside his friend and admirer, M. Dupin, and evidently felt the deepest interest in the result.

lic. They not only consent to comply with the law of 7th Vendémiaire, but they even solicit the presence of the municipal agents at their meetings, to assure themselves that nothing improper is said or done. Nearly all the persons who have been hindered in their attempts to hold meetings, and instruct the people, teach the doctrines of communions, acknowledged and supported by the State; nay, they belong to those communions, and have been properly accredited to perform the very work, for attempting which they were arrested and condemned. This was the case with M. Oster, and with Messrs. Doine and Lemaire. The law of the 7th Vendémiaire was sufficient; and with it, Protestants, and Catholics too, so far as we know, were satisfied.

But we hasten to the decision of the Court. The Chamber, or branch of the tribunal before which the case was tried, consists of fourteen or fifteen judges. Their opinions were divided; twelve being in favor of the judgment pronounced, and two against it. The appeal was rejected, and the accused were discharged, on the ground, that the meetings held by them were not connected with any "*association of more than twenty persons*," but "were formed spontaneously, without being arranged and concerted beforehand." At the same time, principles were laid down which are utterly at variance with the rights of Protestants. But we will give the leading points of this decision.

"Religious liberty," the Court say, "consecrated and guarantied by the Charter, has neither excluded the surveillance of the public authorities, over the meetings which have for their object the performance of worship, nor the measures of police and of safety, without which that surveillance could not be efficacious. Art. 5. accords with the necessity of obtaining the authorization of the Government in the cases contemplated by Art. 291 of the Code. The public order and peace might be compromised, if particular associations, formed in the bosom of different religious sects, or making a pretext of religion, might, without the permission of the Government, erect a pulpit or elevate an altar everywhere.

"The Organic Articles do not permit any part of France to be erected into a parish or sub-parish; or any domestic chapel, or any particular oratory to be established without an express authorization from the Government.

"The free exercise of the religion professed by the ma-

jority of the French, ought to confine itself to these limits; it is subjected to these restrictions; the Organic Articles of the Protestant worship display them under the forms appropriate to that worship; and Arts. 291 and 294 of the Code contain only analogous enactments.

"The law of the 7th Vendémiaire, irreconcilable in the greatest part of its enactments with that of the 18th Germinal, *relative to the organization of public worship*, and deciding on matters which have since been regulated by the Code, is, by the terms of Art. 484, necessarily abrogated. At most, the surveillance and intervention of public authority ought not to be separated from the protection promised to all religions; this protection is also a guaranty of public order; but it cannot be demanded, save by the religions recognised and publicly exercised.

"The virtual abrogation of the Arts. 291, etc., of the Code can be inferred, neither from Art. 5 nor Art. 70 of the Charter."

This is certainly the most wonderful specimen of judicial Jesuitism that we have ever seen. It pronounces the law of the 7th Vendémiaire to be in opposition to the Organic Articles, and therefore null and void: two laws inconsistent, which were made for totally different purposes! The law of the 7th Vendémiaire was intended for all religious persuasions, and has no reference to any established churches, for none then existed. Its object was to secure the public safety, by requiring that all meetings for religious worship should be so held, as to prevent them from being made occasions for plotting the overthrow of the Government. The law of the 18th Germinal was made to unite the Catholic and Protestant churches with the State. This was the sole and avowed object of the Organic Articles. Nor is there the slightest reason for considering the law of the 18th Germinal at variance with the 7th Vendémiaire. The latter agrees fully with Art. 5 of the Charter; and serves as its proper compliment; the two together containing the grant and the definition of religious liberty.

This decision contains another absurdity. It declares the law of the 7th Vendémiaire annulled by the Organic Articles, because, being in conflict, the later law must destroy that which is prior. Why, then, does not the Charter annul Arts. 291 and 294 of the Code, since it is manifestly

at variance with them? And if the Organic Articles are inconsistent with the law of the 7th Vendémiaire, they may be demonstrated to be inconsistent with the Charter; and consequently, they are annulled. But no. The Charter, which ought to be considered the fundamental and organic law of the realm, must yield to every statute, past, present or future, which may impinge it. Absurd as this may seem, it is literally true; and France is the only country, with a constitutional government, in which the constitution is put on a par with an ordinary enactment. But the most flagrant iniquity of this decision consists in this: it destroys the very existence of true religious liberty, by restricting it to those who belong to the established churches, Catholic and Protestant. Its effect upon those who do not join these churches, and who wish to sustain public worship according to their convictions of duty, is equivalent to a judgment of the highest tribunal in England, which should pronounce every law passed in favour of the Dissenters, during a long lapse of time, null and void, and send them all back to the established church! And this in a country which boasts of its progress in civil and religious liberty within the last half century! M. Dupin, in his speech on the trial which issued in the above decision, asserted, that in this respect, France was on a par with England, though he seemed to hesitate, as to the question of her equality with the United States.

We pass now from the attempts of the Government to curtail, if not destroy, the rights of the Protestants, through the *tribunals*, to its recent efforts by *Executive intervention*. The development of the plans by which this was to be effected, is contained in the first of the five pamphlets mentioned at the head of this article. To the exposure of this daring attempt—now happily abandoned—the last four are devoted.

Last winter M. Teste, then Minister of Justice and Religion, and Keeper of the Seals, prepared a *projet* of an ordonnance for regulating the Reformed churches; and submitted it to a committee of distinguished Protestants at Paris, who examined the measure with him at several sittings.*

* This committee were Messrs. Baron de Daunan, a Peer of France; Leon de Malleville, Deputy; François Delessert, Deputy and Member of the Consistory of Paris; Vernes, do.;

The original *projet* was modified in many respects by the suggestions of this committee. It was then reviewed by the Minister, and sent to the *Committee of Legislation* of the Council of State. By that Committee, it was so remodelled, that all that was valuable—the sections relating to Presbyterial councils in the affiliated consistorial churches—was entirely discarded, and many new and dangerous articles were added. M. Teste, dissatisfied with the *projet* as thus amended, resolved to submit it, with his own, to the consistories of the Reformed church, and take their advice. For this purpose, he caused the two to be printed in parallel columns, so that it could be seen at a glance, wherein they agreed and wherein they disagreed. This document was accompanied by a brief circular, dated Jan. 31, 1840; in which the Minister requested the consistories to return their opinion on the several articles of both *projets*, on a third column, left blank for that purpose. All, we believe, have made their report; and, contrary to what we feared at first, the majority, in number and influence, returned answers decidedly averse to both projects, and, indeed, to any which should not emanate from their synods.

We will give a few articles from the *projet* prepared by the *Committee of Legislation*.

"Art. 1. The limits of the consistorial churches cannot be fixed, or modified, except according to the following forms.* The Prefect (of the department) shall previously direct an inquiry to be made in the communes interested; the consis-

---

Ed. Laffon de Ladébat, do.; Juillerat, Pastor and President of the Consistory; Monod, Pastor; Coquerel, Pastor; and two or three others.

* The consistories of the Reformed churches of France are not consistories of single churches; but one consistory includes all the churches within certain limits. The consistory of Paris governs, not only the Reformed churches connected with the state in the city, but that at Versailles, 12 miles distant, and others. The consistories of Orleans, Bordeaux, Toulouse, Lyons, Lille, Rouen, embrace several churches, some of them at a considerable distance. The chief or metropolitan church is often called the consistorial church.—But the expression *Consistorial Churches* denotes the groups of churches governed by consistories.

tory shall be called to give its advice; it shall be authorized by an ordonnance rendered in our Council of State; the ordonnance shall designate, by name, the communes comprised in each consistorial district."

The cloven foot is pretty well developed here, we think. There can be no extension of the consistorial churches—that is, no increase of their number by the erection of new ones in the thousands of communes which are not within the limits of any one of the 89 consistories unless the Prefect of the department—in nine cases out of ten a Roman Catholic or a Gallio—chooses to direct an inquiry, on the result of which he is to decide. An *ordonnance* is to give effect to the proposed extension, if allowed. But mark, an ordonnance is to designate the communes which may be comprised in a consistory! The result would be to shut up the Protestants, like wild beasts, in certain districts, out of which they will find it difficult, as we shall presently see, to have the privileges of religious instruction, from the teachers whom they prefer.

"Art. 2. The consistories shall not erect any temple (church) unless its erection shall have been authorized by an ordonnance rendered by our Council of State." This provision is designed to throw as many difficulties as possible in the way of the spread of Protestantism in France; and especially to defeat the plans of the Evangelical and other Societies.

"Art. 3. No other place shall be appropriated to the performance of public worship within the district of a consistorial church, except on the request of the consistory, and with the authorization of the Prefect." Here we have the complement of the iniquity of Art. 2. No matter how inconvenient it may be for the residents within the limits of a consistory to repair to the church, they must not open a private house, or barn, or even consecrate, we presume, a field or forest for public worship, without the authorization of the Prefect, in answer to a request of the consistory!

But this Article has a supplement;—"only the pastors of the consistorial church shall perform there the functions of the ministry of the gospel." In other words, when permission has been given to open a barn, private house, or church for public worship, none but one of the pastors of the churches included in the limits of the consistory, can preach in it!

This interferes at once with the usages of the Reformed church, in a most important point—the employment of evangelists. Besides, if the pastors of the consistory are sick, absent or dead, the poor, scattered flocks must remain unsupplied with the bread of life, even though they have permission to worship in a private house or barn. No assistant preacher can be employed by any of the pastors; no one can supply a vacant church; and no pastor can come from another consistory!

"Art. 25. In case of an insufficiency in the credits allowed by the State for the creation of new places for pastors, they may be established, upon the request of the consistories, of associations of the members, and of the communes, under charge of an engagement taken, on their part, to provide for the support of the new pastor, for his lodging, and the expenses which may result from this new arrangement. These places of pastors shall be created, after inquiry and advice had by the municipal councils, by an ordonnance rendered in our Council of State." We have now reached the climax. No consistory nor society, nor even the communes can make provision for the support, *at their own expense*, of an additional pastor, without an ordonnance of the Government, issued upon the inquiry and advice of the municipal councils! We stop here. We can go no further in the examination of this deeply concocted scheme of oppression.

But who were the authors, or advisers of this singular and ominous movement on the part of the Government? Some say, the Roman Catholics. There are bigots enough, among them, we doubt not—even in the higher clergy—who would rejoice to see almost any measures adopted to check the growth of Protestantism. But the iniquity of this plan, we think, does not lie at their door. There has been in France, as our readers know, a considerable revival of the faith and piety of the Reformation. As the evangelical party is zealous and enterprising, their number augments with considerable rapidity. But the dead Socinian, neological portion of the Protestants detest and dread the doctrines, and the efforts of the Evangelical party. Its leading men, it is said, have importuned the Government for years, to do something to arrest the labors of their adversaries. At length, they were on the point of having their wishes even more than gratified:—for we think that the above scheme has gone beyond what they

desired. M. Coquerel, indeed, has frankly confessed, that there are many things in both projects which he could not approve.

But whoever were the advisers of this plan, it has met with a rough reception. The *Semeur*, the *Espérance*, and the *Archives du Christianisme*, three important religious and literary journals, have given it a thorough examination, and have condemned it in the most decided manner. But the first, and one of the ablest attacks upon it, is contained in the above "letter of a layman to a pastor," by M. Lutteroth. To this, M. Coquerel, a distinguished preacher of Paris, of the Anti-Evangelical party, replied. He endeavors to show, that the Protestant churches of France need some new rules of government. And we think this perfectly manifest from his "letter to a pastor." But desirous as he is to have the disorders, which have crept into their system, corrected by a new ordonnance, he seems not less anxious to have that ordonnance bear on the *Methodists*, as he calls the Evangelical party, so as to exclude their efforts from the pale of the Reformed church. To this letter, M. Agénor De Gasparin—a pious young nobleman, son of the ex-Minister of that name and himself Master of Requests to the Council of State—has replied in the most able and admirable manner. He boldly maintains the necessity of granting to those who separate from the National churches, entire liberty of worship; and demonstrates, that their labors are eminently useful. He thinks, however, that they should be willing to be called Dissenters, as they are in fact, and not maintain, as some do, that they belong to the National Reformed church, because they love its ancient doctrines and discipline. The fact that they do not receive the aid of the Government, in building their churches and supporting their pastors, and are not willing that it should interfere in their affairs, really constitutes them Dissenters.

This excellent letter called forth another, addressed to himself, from M. Martin-Paschoud. Respecting this we need say but little, as it contains almost nothing which bears on our subject. M. Martin is reputed to be an amiable man; but it is grievous to see him attack the great doctrines of the gospel—justification by faith, the divinity of Christ, etc. etc.—which M. De Gasparin had so nobly avowed and maintained. It excites our pity also to read his remarks

respecting the "Methodists;" which display a very bitter spirit, and are altogether unworthy of him.*

Owing to the resistance made to the proposed measure, the present Minister of Justice and Religion, M. Vivien, has announced, we understand, that the Government will drop the business. But what security have the Protestants, that the subject will not be resumed, at some future and no distant day, and an ordonnance issued to accomplish suddenly, what has now been prevented by discussion? None whatever. In the mean time, however, the Evangelical party will not be idle. They feel that their cause is a good one, and must prevail. They have nothing to expect from the tribunals of justice;† still there is much which they can do, and more which they can hope to accomplish hereafter.

The laws, as interpreted by the Courts, must be followed

---

* We cannot refrain from saying that we utterly condemn the spirit of an anonymous pamphlet, entitled *Lettres à M. le Pasteur Martin-Paschoud, par quelques-uns de ses amis et de ses Collègues.*

† The question of Religious Liberty cannot be considered as finally adjudicated in France. The Court of Cassation embraces three chambers, or divisions;—*the Chamber of Requests, the Chamber for Criminal Causes*, and *the Chamber for Civil Causes.* The whole number of judges in this court is 50; and they are about equally divided among the three divisions. Appeals from the inferior tribunals are made to the Chamber which corresponds to their character. Most cases are decided finally by the Chambers; but sometimes a cause comes before the entire Court. This happens when a case has been tried before a Chamber, on an appeal from a Royal Court, and the decision is against that of the Royal Court. In this event, the cause must be sent down to be tried, by the Royal court *nearest* to the one which tried it before. If the decision of the second Royal Court coincide with that of the first Royal Court, then there may be an appeal to the entire Court of Cassation. No case of involving the right of religious worship, has yet been carried so far. Nor do we suppose there would be the slightest use in it. The two cases before the Chamber for Criminal Causes have so fully developed the opinions of the judges (and there is every reason to believe that the majority of the whole Court hold the same opinions) that it would be in vain to go further.

as closely as possible. Permission must be asked for opening chapels and other places of public worship. If this be refused by the Mayors, it must be asked of the Prefect of the department. If refused by him, it must be asked of the Minister of the Interior. If refused by him, the attempt must be abandoned. But as each case will be examined on its own merits, a refusal may be less frequent than our readers would at first suppose. We cannot, for a moment, attribute to the Government the settled purpose to allow no further extension of the Protestant religion. It knows full well, that there are thousands of Protestants in France who cannot hear the gospel from ministers of their own faith. They are to be found in every department, and in almost every commune. It will hardly deny to these the liberty of worshipping God as their fathers did. Besides, flagrant cases of refusal by magistrates may be carried to the tribunals with hope of success. And last of all, the subject must be discussed in the journals; and when the proper time comes, it must be carried, by petitions, to the Chambers, and legislative action invoked. Sooner or later it must come to this; nor will there be permanent and universal redress found anywhere, save in a favorable enactment of the legislative body.

We close this notice—protracted much beyond our original design—with three or four general remarks:

1. It is surprising to see how little progress Religious Liberty has made in France during the last forty years. Indeed nothing has been gained since 1802. Arbitrary and tyrannical as were the Organic Articles, and subversive as they were of the discipline of the Protestant churches, it is a mournful fact that they have nothing better at the present day. And, as if this were not enough, Arts. 291 and 294 of the Code made during the imperial domination in 1810, must be added to restrict and fetter their movements! The distressing conviction is forced upon us, that the Protestants of France, as to the enjoyment of their rights—we will not say, their privileges and favors—are just where they were under the despotism of Napoleon, and the bigotry of Louis XVIII. and Charles X. The revolution of July 1830 has done nothing for them. The liberty, promised in the Charter is the sheerest illusion, that ever mocked the expectations of wronged and suffering humanity.

2. It must be confessed that the Government has no easy task to perform. First of all, there is the influence of infidelity, and that total indifference to religion which prevails, to a great degree, among those who figure in and about the Government, and who regard with jealousy every effort made by the friends of Christianity to promote its extension. Next, there is the great and increasing power of the Catholics,—comprising the vast majority of those who take any interest in religion,—whose favor the Ministry naturally desire to secure. That the Government is still greatly subject to this influence, unconscious perhaps of its extent, is to us most certain. We will give a few extracts, bearing on this point, from an article which recently appeared in the Courrier Français. "We have seen the Government, ever since the Revolution of 1830, shut up the churches of Dissenters, deliver their founders to the tribunals, and cause them to be condemned to penalties more or less severe. In vain was it declared, during the discussion of the law against associations (in 1834) in the name of the Government, in the two Chambers, that the liberty of worship would suffer no damage from it; that the law would not be applied to meetings for worship: the contrary has happened.

"Some orators had made some reserves, relative to religious congregations and monastic orders, suppressed by the Organic Laws. These congregations, these orders, have multiplied; their chiefs have publicly unfurled their banners, retaken their titles, and resumed costumes which the laws of our Legislatures had abolished. If nothing more than their toleration had been granted, it would, perhaps, have been a homage to the principles of liberty; although the result would have been to augment the influence of a hierarchy, already sustained by immense privileges. But the Government has done more to please the clergy, (Catholic,) whose political support it courts; grants have been made to many at the public expense; they have been exempted from imposts; many of them have been authorized, simply by an ordonnance,* to become teachers of youth, to receive gifts and legacies, as public establishments.

---

* There is a vast difference between a *law* and an *ordonnance*. A *law* is an enactment of the two Chambers, approved by the

"The political interests of the moment have triumphed; the advice of the Council of State has not only been rejected by the Ministerial power, but all publicity has been refused to it, for fear of alarming the powerful hierarchy which sustains the abuses. And the partiality was rendered more evident by the prosecutions, the fines and the condemnation to corporeal punishment, by which it was attempted to break down those who believed the promises of the Charter. Not that we approve the efforts to introduce, within the last few years, new sorts of religious worship into the kingdom; but it ought to be left to public opinion to do justice to them. It is only necessary to look after any thing in these new doctrines, which may attack public and religious morality, the sacredness of marriage, the proprieties and the foundations of society.

"The Government has turned against the weak; this result might have been foreseen. Instead of endeavouring to recover its independence, by retrenching abuses which may render formidable the opposition of the Catholic clergy, and substituting the liberty of worship for the system of Concordats—which has introduced into the State a power spiritual and moral in appearance, but political and secret in reality, and rivalling the national sovereignty—it contents itself with regulating the Jewish and Protestant worship!"

3. It is striking to observe, how far political freedom is in advance of religious liberty. This fact is illustrated not only in the history of France. Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Prussia, and several of the smaller states of Germany—Protestant countries, and some of them possessing considerable political liberty—have no real religious liberty. A man may be a Protestant, and enjoy the right of worship fully in the *established* churches; but if he undertake to hold meetings, for the edification of himself and such as choose to attend them, he will soon find insuperable obstacles in his way, and it will be well if he escapes imprisonment. Belgium, since the Revolution of 1830, has more religious liberty than any other country on the Continent. This is owing to the influ-

---

King. An *ordonnance* is an executive order, in the name of the King. Unfortunately, the latter have become too frequent of late.

ence of De Potter and some others, in forming the Constitution. In opening a place for public worship, all that is there required is, that notice of the fact be given to the municipal authorities, that they may prevent disturbances. With few exceptions, religious liberty is wholly unknown in the Republics of South America. Even in England, Dissenters are not free from all embarrassments. It is only in the United States, and we may now add Texas, that real religious liberty exists—where the Government protects all in their right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience, without let, hinderance or distinction of any sort.*

4. It is really astonishing to see how little the subject of religious liberty is understood on the Continent of Europe. The people are so accustomed to have the Government meddle with every thing, and the Government are so fearful of allowing the people to do any thing, save through their condescending grace and permission, that they are incapable of comprehending the simplest elements of religious freedom. We know that there are difficulties attending this question, grave certainly, but not insuperable. It is not necessary that the established churches should be overthrown. We are no advocates for sudden and violent measures. Let establishments be maintained for those who prefer them and are willing to be taxed for their support. But let those who prefer a church having no connection with the State, and are also willing to bear the expense, enjoy their preference. "Only think, sir," said one in Holland, where, we are sorry to say, the Government has treated most cruelly some zealous, good, but injudicious Dissenters within the last few years; "only think, sir, that in the meetings of these Methodists they sometimes sing and pray very loud, and sometimes they cry out 'O dear Jesus,' in their prayers! Is that to be tolerated?" "But do these people disturb their neighbours?" "No, that cannot be affirmed." "Are they immoral

---

* It is hardly necessary to say, that the religious liberty which we advocate is *a full and equal liberty for all*, whether Protestants or Catholics. We abhor, with our whole hearts, the disabilities and oppressions which the Catholics suffer in some Protestant countries; where *bigotry* rules in place of *justice*, and where *might* usurps the prerogative of *right*,

in their conduct?" "No, they are good citizens." "Then let them sing praises and pray as much as they please; and when your police want something to do, let them look after your dram-shops, and the noisy, drunken rabble that collect about them." But this Hollander is not alone in wondering how people can be allowed to assemble in prayer-meetings whenever they please, and cry out, as he expressed it, "*O cher Jesus! O cher Jesus!*"

ARTICLE IX.

Remarks in reference to an Anonymous "Essay on Cause and Effect," and to the Questions of "Inquirer."—Am. Bib. Repos. for April, 1840.

By Leonard Woods, D. D. Prof. of Theol., Theol. Sem. Andover, Mass.

[Continued from page 242.]

The essay referred to treats of various topics which deserve a serious consideration, but which have not yet been noticed in my remarks. At present only one of these will be introduced, namely: the question, *whether self-love is the spring of all voluntary action.*

This question is suggested by the following passage in the essay,* (p. 387.) "According to the doctrine of free agency, the mind of man is endowed with a constitutional desire for happiness, which is the steady, abiding feeling of the mind, and is the mainspring of all the mental activity included in volition." I know not that the author would seriously advocate the principle which seems to be implied in this passage. Be that as it may, the inquiry is an important one; *whether all our choices and voluntary actions proceed from self-love, or a desire for our own happiness.*

If it is, as the anonymous writer seems to hold, then

---

* The essay here referred to was published in the Repository for October 1839, p. 381. seq.

there is clearly a "uniform, invariable" connection of volition with an antecedent motive. And this "*uniform, invariable antecedence*" would, according to that writer, involve the essence of fatalism; and the fatalism would be universal, leaving no place for free moral agency. For it "the desire for happiness is the mainspring of *all* the mental activity included in volition," that is, of *all* voluntary action; then all voluntary action stands in an invariable connection with one and the same antecedent motive, and, of course, excludes what the author calls *free agency*.

I am, however, far from admitting that self-love, or the desire of our own happiness, is the great motive, "the mainspring" of all voluntary action. But I must content myself with a few brief observations on the subject. And perhaps even these are unnecessary to those, who have attentively read such authors as Cudworth, Brown, Payne, Hopkins, Coleridge, and Wayland.

That self-love is *not* the spring of all voluntary action, may, I think, be made quite evident.

First, *there are many principles*, and some of them very powerful principles, *in the human mind*, which prove springs of "that mental action which is involved in volition." Love of offspring, pity for the distressed, gratitude for favors, and other natural affections and propensities, are as truly elements of our mental constitution, as the desire of our own happiness; and each one of them is as truly a spring of voluntary action, as self-love. How then can self-love, or the desire of our own happiness, be the spring of *all* voluntary action? We can say with truth, it is *one* of the springs. In *all* minds, it is a *powerful* spring. But is it therefore the *only* spring? In *some* minds, it is the *most powerful* spring, —the *supreme* motive—yea, perchance, the motive which governs almost *exclusively*. But because this is the case in *some* minds, can we conclude that it is so in *all*, even in those which are the most pure and holy? Take the man, who loves God with all his heart and soul and mind and strength;—the man who loves Christ above father and mother, houses and lands, and every worldly object. Has he no spring of action above the desire of his own happiness? Is not his affection to God and to Christ a motive distinct from self-love, and of a far higher and nobler nature? And do not those who maintain, that a desire for happiness

is the spring of all voluntary action, manifestly overlook important principles, and attempt to simplify beyond nature, and in opposition to truth? They discover that self-love is a very powerful motive to action, and then conclude that it is the *only* one. Others, who find *gratitude* to be a powerful motive to action, might, with the same justice, conclude that *this* is the only motive. And others again, finding that pity for the *distressed* operates as a motive to exertion, might lose sight of every thing else, and hold that *all* our actions result from *pity*, and might labor to show that our motives to action are all to be resolved into this as their pervading element.

Farther:—It is not only true, that there are many motives of volition, *besides* self-love, but that some of those motives are evidently of *superior moral worth.* Every man who suffers himself to think, must be satisfied that this is the case. Suppose you know that a man performs an action or makes a sacrifice from pure love to God, or to man, without the least reference, either in his thoughts or feelings, to his own private good. Do you not at once pronounce it a deed of uncommon excellence? Even that benevolence which is mixed with other things, and of which we can only say, that it has *more* influence than self-love, is regarded as a virtue. But that benevolence which is wholly disinterested, i. e., which does not proceed from any aim, direct or indirect, to promote our own gratification, is the object of universal admiration. And how many seek that admiration by *appearing* to be actuated by such benevolence, though really destitute of it. But in this, as in all other cases, the counterfeit proves the existence of the coin which is counterfeited.

It may perhaps be said, that while we are influenced by love to God or to man, or by parental affection, we experience *pleasure;* and from this it may be inferred, that a *desire* for this pleasure is, at bottom, the mainspring of all moral action, and that all our other motives are to be resolved into this. But what is there in logic, or in experience, which can justify such an inference? The fact that we are *pleased* with the accomplishment of any object, as the honor of God, or the good of man, implies that we *love* that object antecedently to the pleasure we enjoy in it. Without the existence of such love to the object, how could the promo-

tion of it give pleasure? It is evident that the *pleasure* results from the pre-existent *affection*, and not the *affection* from a wish to obtain *pleasure*.

No one can doubt, that a desire for our own happiness is *often*, yea, *too* often, the spring of our voluntary actions. But does it follow from this, that it is *always* so? How can that be considered as a motive to action, which is in no way contemplated by us,—which is not before the mind as an object of thought or desire, at the time of action? Look at a loving father, who, at the hazard of his own life, rushes into the water or the fire to rescue his little children. What *moves* him to do this? Is it a regard to his own gratification or pleasure? But he will tell you, he had no thought of this, and that he was moved and urged on to do what he did, by the *love* and *pity of his heart* for his dear suffering children. If he succeeded in preserving their life, he did indeed experience a high degree of pleasure, as a consequence. But to say that a *desire* for that pleasure was the *motive* of the parent's efforts, would be a contradiction to his own consciousness, and an abuse of language. And surely a devout *Christian* may, sometimes at least, be so influenced, so constrained, so borne on by love to Christ, that all thought of himself and all desire for his own gratification will be excluded, and his fervent, holy love become the great and only motive of action. Facts of this kind do most certainly occur in the history of Christians.

When David Brainerd, in his last sickness, entered on a serious examination of his religious state, he made it a subject of particular inquiry, whether he had exercised any affections, or performed any actions, which could not be traced to self-love, and which must have arisen from a higher principle, than a regard to his own happiness. He considered this as the surest test of a regenerate state. In how many instances are Christians, at the commencement of their course, and afterwards, conscious of loving God and rejoicing in his government, without any reference in their thoughts to their own interests, temporal or eternal? And is not such pure love to God, such a rising above private interest, and such annihilation of self generally regarded as among the clearest marks of holiness, and as what may be expected to exist in proportion to the measure of sanctification? It is indeed true of the unregenerate, that they are

"lovers of themselves." They have no moral affection of a higher character than self-love. But can it be the same with those who bear the image of Christ? Is it true of them, as it is of the wicked, that self-love is the real motive of *all* their moral actions? Is there no object in the universe which they love, except in subserviency to their own personal welfare? Is all duty performed by saints and angels from that one principle? To suppose this seems to me just as unphilosophical and untrue, as to suppose that all the operations in the *natural* world are to be traced to the power of *gravitation*, or to the power of *steam*, or to *electricity*. True philosophy leads us to account for the phenomena in the natural world by a great *variety* of principles or laws, many of which are entirely distinct from each other. And why should it not lead us to do the same in the *moral* world, and to trace the actions of intelligent, moral beings, to all that variety of principles or motives, from which they evidently result? Why should we refuse to admit what is so manifest, that a *variety* of causes or springs of action as really exists and operates in the world of *mind*, as in the world of *matter?*

I now proceed to the questions and remarks of the writer in the April No. of the American Biblical Repository, (Art. 10,) who conceals his real name, and calls himself "Inquirer." He doubtless has sufficient reasons for writing anonymously. But he will excuse me for asking, what weight there is in the reasons which he suggests in his "Apology." He thinks he may be allowed to conceal his name, because he does not come forward as a *teacher*, but as a *learner*. But why is it less proper for one, who presents himself before the public as an "Inquirer" and learner, to make known his real name, than for one who presents himself as a teacher? It is certainly very honorable for a man to "take the attitude of a learner;" especially if, in that modest attitude, he manifests high intellectual attainments, and gives his readers reason to think that he is able to *teach*, as well as to *learn*.

But I have no disposition to complain of "Inquirer," for not giving his name to the public, or of the editor for allowing him to appear under a fictitious title. Nor will I evade the difficult task of answering his inquiries because he writes anonymously. As the questions are important, I will seri-

ously consider them, without being anxious to know from whom they come. I am very willing to converse with persons behind the curtain, whose words I hear, but whose faces I have not the pleasure to see, on condition that they treat subjects with Christian propriety, and show by their words, that they are worthy of particular respect, as the two anonymous writers do, with whom I am concerned in these discussions. After all, must it not seem rather singular for me, in my own name, to be publicly discussing subjects with two writers, possessed of no ordinary powers of mind, but who conceal their names? I however make no objection. Still one in my case cannot be quite certain how the thing will end. If I should commit mistakes, or if I should be unsuccessful in my efforts, and so expose myself to shame, I might wish I had done as others have done, and wisely availed myself of the benefit of concealment. On the other hand, if my respected, but anonymous friends find, as they may, that they have well escaped the hazards of authorship, and have gained honor to themselves by their anonymous publications; it will be easy for them to let the world know to whom the honor belongs.

It is well understood, how much more difficult it is to answer questions, than to ask them. And what if I should think it best, by and by, to invert the present order, and to take upon myself, as I have a right to do, the humbler and easier task of *asking* questions, and to transfer to "Inquirer," the more honorable and difficult task of *answering* them? And if a man of such obvious and eminent characteristics as he possesses, should proceed a little farther in laying open his mind, and should be as free in answering as he has been in asking questions, he might perhaps make himself sufficiently known without the form of giving his name.

"Inquirer" says, he finds "difficulties in *most* of the systems of mental philosophy" which he reads. It seems to be implied, that he does not find difficulties in *all* of them; that there is at least some one system, in which he finds no difficulties. I would then at once "take the attitude of a learner," and ask him, what that system is. To me, thus far, *all* systems of mental philosophy have had their difficulties. I have not been able to fix upon any system, however well supported by argument, against which speculative ob-

jections and difficulties could not be urged. And if I had refused to believe every truth, or system of truths, which was exposed to difficulties that I could not fully obviate, I should have believed nothing. If, however, "Inquirer" has found a system which is encumbered with no difficulties, as his expression seems to imply, he will confer a great favor on me, and on many others, by making us acquainted with it. But, for the present, I am fully convinced, that the only safe and proper way is, *to believe that which is proved by sufficient evidence, especially by Scripture evidence, whatever speculative difficulties may attend it.* If our faith in divine truth is shaken, if it in the least degree *wavers*, on account of insolvable difficulties, we shall suffer a loss that cannot be measured.

But what "Inquirer" says afterwards, shows that we may have mistaken his meaning, and that he did not intend to signify that he was acquainted with any system of mental philosophy which is free from difficulties. For he says, distinctly, that he has not found "terra firma extensive enough to choose his dwelling-place;" and he is looking for "new treatises," making improvements upon all the old systems. He shows a commendable zeal for the advancement of mental science, and thinks "it is time that more were said and done in relation to this great subject." With a little modification my opinion coincides with his. I would say, "it is time that *more*" or *less* "were said and done." On this subject, especially, smattering is to be deprecated. "Drink deep, or taste not."

"Inquirer" says, (p. 458,) he never can love dispute, until he has "a new *taste*," and speaks of this as my "philosophical word." I was somewhat surprised that he should call the word *taste*, used metaphorically in relation to the mind, a *philosophical* word. For I supposed that the precision required in philosophical discourse led philosophers, as far as possible, to avoid metaphorical words. Figurative language is most freely used in poetry, eloquence and common discourse. The analogy between *taste* in the *literal* sense, and an *inclination* or *desire* of the *mind*, is very obvious; and accordingly the word has been very frequently used to express such an inclination or desire. It is a just and striking *figure*, not a *philosophical* term. But if it *were* a philosophical word, I know not why he should call it *mine*, as though *I* had invent-

ed it, or as though I used it more than others. The word has been familiarly used by the best English writers, particularly by the standard divines of New England, as Edwards, Dwight, Backus, Griffin, etc. This I might show by an abundance of quotations. But I shall content myself with citing a single passage from a recent and well-known writer. I refer to the Rev. Moses Stuart, my respected colleague. Speaking of infants, he says: "To enjoy the sacred pleasures of that place," (heaven,) "there must be a *positive taste* for them. If now infants are saved, (which I do hope and trust is the case,) then there must be such a *relish implanted* in their souls for the holy joys of heaven. Is there nothing, then, which Christ by his Spirit can do for them, in imparting such a *taste?*" See his Commentary on Romans, Edit. 1832, Excursus iv. p. 549.

One word more by way of introduction. My own experience has taught me, that there are many and very stubborn difficulties hanging round the subject before us, whenever contemplated in a speculative or theoretic manner. To untie all the knots which can be untied, and to determine clearly those which cannot, is no easy task. Whoever attempts to do this,—whoever undertakes to answer the hardest questions, which the most powerful intellect can propose on this hardest of all subjects, ought to have time and space give him, and to be treated with a good measure of patience and candor by his readers.

The first topic which "Inquirer" introduces, relates to the sinner's inability (p. 458). He refers to my question respecting one who is unregenerate. "While he remains in his natural state, can he, by the power of his will, prevent it," (i. e. the feeling of enmity,) "and call forth the affection of love, and so be subject to the law of God?" This question he rightly understands as implying that the sinner *cannot* do this. The difficulties which he suggests in relation to this subject, may be summed up in the single question, *What is the sense of the words* "*can*" and "*cannot*," *as here used?*

I must begin my remarks by saying, that I feel utterly unable to do any thing which can be satisfactory to "Inquirer," unless he admits the distinction so often made, especially in New England, between the different senses in which the words *can* and *cannot* are used. That they are used in senses which are essentially different from each other, is

perfectly manifest. If we can satisfy ourselves what these senses are, and then determine definitely which of them is to be given to the words, when used in relation to the present subject, we shall have a prospect of arriving at a just conclusion, otherwise not.

The distinction referred to is between *natural* and *moral* inability;—i. e. between inability used in a *natural* sense, or in relation to *natural objects*, and in a *moral* sense, or in relation to *moral* objects. In the first sense, it is, as Fuller describes it, "a want of rational faculties, bodily powers or external advantages." It is *such a want of natural powers or faculties of body or mind, or such a want of the necessary means or opportunities, as excludes obligation, and prevents blameworthiness.* "Inquirer" doubtless knows how Edwards, Bellamy, West, Smalley, Spring, Griffin, Andrew Fuller and other distinguished writers illustrate this kind of inability; and how clearly they show, that it excludes obligation and ill-desert; as when a man cannot see or hear because he has no eyes or ears; or cannot walk because his limbs are palsied; cannot understand Newton's Principia for want of sufficient strength of intellect, or opportunity for study; or cannot pay his debts, though he is heartily disposed and makes all possible efforts to do it. In all cases of this kind, the inability is of such a nature, as to furnish a just excuse. That which hinders the performance is such, that every one sees there can be no blame.

Natural impossibility is explained in the same way;—*natural necessity* is the opposite. A thing takes place by *a natural necessity*, when it certainly results from the operation of natural causes, as the falling of a stone, or a man's going to a place, when compelled against his will.

Moral inability is that which results from *moral causes*, such as the dispositions and habits of the mind. In this sense, a man is unable to do a thing, when he is effectually hindered by his own inclinations, or the state of his mind. When we say: "God *cannot* lie," we set forth that moral excellence of his character, which certainly prevents him from doing wrong. And when we say of a just judge, that he *cannot* accept of a bribe, and of a kind mother, that she *cannot* forget her beloved child, we refer to a hinderance of a *moral* kind. The just judge is prevented from accepting a bribe by the principle of *moral integrity*, and the mother

from forgetting her child, by *maternal love.* In all cases like these, the *greater* the *inability,* in other words, the greater the hinderance in the way of doing the thing mentioned, the more praiseworthy is the person. Here moral inability results from moral excellence, or is involved in it. Thus far all is clear.

Again: a person in this moral sense is unable to do *right* when he is hindered from doing it by some *wrong* disposition or habit of mind; as when we say, that a man of a malevolent, revengeful temper *cannot* love his enemy, or that a miser *cannot* give away his money, or that a man of a low, base character *cannot* do a generous, noble deed. It is this sort of inability, to which the sacred writers evidently refer, when they teach, that those who are accustomed to do evil, cannot learn to do well; that those who receive honor of men cannot believe; that those who have the carnal mind cannot please God. In all such cases, the greater the *inability,*—i. e. the greater that sinful disposition or habit of mind which hinders a man from doing right,—the greater is his blameworthiness. This is so plain, that all must agree in it. If any one denies it, he will soon contradict himself. It is a practical truth. Whatever is doubtful, this is certain,—that, in the sight of God, and in the view of every unperverted mind, a man is criminal and ill-deserving, in proportion to the strength of that wrong disposition, affection or habit of mind which hinders him from doing his duty.

Thus it appears that, in regard to results, the distinction between natural and moral inability is perfectly manifest, and exceedingly important. *Natural* inability excludes obligation and blame. If it is entire, it entirely excludes blame. *Moral* inability to do *wrong* implies moral excellence. If it exists in the highest degree, as it does in God, it denotes the highest degree of excellence. In man, it implies goodness and praiseworthiness in proportion to its degree. On the other hand, moral inability to do *right* implies ill-desert, and implies it in proportion to the inability. And whenever the sacred writers predicate this inability of the sinner, they do it to set forth his criminality. When they predicate it strongly, they do it to set forth the high degree of his criminality. And were it not that our moral senses are blunted by sin, we should

always so understand it. If any rational, moral being should say of himself, or if another should say of him, that he *cannot love the all-perfect, glorious God,* we should be astonished at his baseness, and should exclaim: *How desperately wicked must his heart be!*

In regard to the expression of mine, above referred to, implying that the unrenewed sinner *cannot* call forth the affection of love to God and so be subject to his law, I might at once resort to the word of God, and show that the inspired writers make the same representation. The passages in which they familiarly do this, are so well known, that they need not be quoted. Now the single fact, that men, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, frequently affirmed that unrenewed sinners *cannot* believe and obey, is, by itself, sufficient to justify us in using the same language on the same subject. What better reason can we have for any doctrine, or for any mode of teaching it, than that we find it in the infallible word of God? Can we have a surer standard than the Bible? Look at the texts, in which it is familiarly and strongly affirmed, that men, in their natural state, *cannot* believe in Christ, or be subject to the law; and tell me, whether the inspired writers used words *correctly?* Had they good reason to speak as they did? And when *we* speak of the same subject, and with reference to the same aspect of the subject, have we not good reason to speak in the same manner?— Does the word of God need to be corrected or altered? It does indeed need *explanation.* But does it need *mending?* This then is the stand I take; and I do not expect to be moved from it. *Christ and the apostles were right. They taught the truth; and the manner of their teaching was just and unexceptionable.* They had satisfactory reasons for using just such language as they did. And they are good examples for us, as to the manner of giving religious instruction. It is allowed by all that their language was intended for common people, and suited to common apprehension. So that, whatever we may say respecting the proper language of philosophy or metaphysics, we are sure, that the language of the Bible is the proper language of those who preach the gospel. I am aware that some preachers at the present day are not accustomed to use the language of Scripture on this subject. Indeed they give us reason to

think that they dislike it. For when it comes right in their way, and when it would be the most natural thing in the world for them to make use of the striking, impressive language of the word of God, they still avoid it, and substistute other language quite different and opposite. In the very place, where Christ and the apostles unhesitatingly say that the unrenewed sinner *cannot* believe and obey, these preachers unhesitatingly speak out, and say he *can*. Now, soberly, if I should discover any thing like this in myself; if when the inspired writers are accustomed to use one mode of speaking, I should be accustomed to use the opposite; if while Christ teaches that those who are governed by the love of worldly honor *cannot* believe, I should have a habit of saying they *can* believe; if while *he* teaches that sinners *cannot* come to him, except they are drawn of the Father, *I* should affirm the opposite; and while *he* declares that a bad tree *cannot* bear good fruit, *I* should boldly declare that it *can;* and if, in direct contradiction to the apostle, I should affirm that men in their natural state *can* obey the law and please God;—if I should detect in myself this practice of shunning the language of the Bible and using the opposite in its place; I should think it high time for me to be alarmed at my want of reverence for the word of God, and to inquire seriously for the cause which had turned me aside. I know, for a certainty, that Christ and the apostles had a just view of our nature and relations. They understood human obligation, and the grounds of it. They understood moral agency, and the *philosophy* of moral agency. And yet, speaking in the words which the Holy Ghost taught, they declared that sinners *cannot* believe and obey, and that without Christ even Christians can do nothing. Yes, they affirmed this, repeatedly, and without qualification. And certainly they had a sound judgment, and a concern for the good of men, and knew, better than we do, how to teach divine truth, and how to guard against whatever would expose men to mistake. Nor do we find that they used different language at different times, sometimes saying that sinners *cannot* obey, and sometimes, that they *can*. And shall we take upon us to be wiser than the inspired writers, and to improve upon their language? I start back from the thought of any thing either in principle or practice, which implies that the words of inspiration are

not fit to be used in popular religious discourse, and which would lead us customarily to avoid them, and to introduce language of a different import, when speaking on the same subject, and in the same connection.

But "Inquirer" calls for an explanation of my language. This I shall endeavor to give. He first refers (p. 458) to several instances, in which *can* is used in Scripture, and common parlance, with an implied negative, signifying that the thing spoken of is "*very difficult, very revolting or very improbable;* and then asks, *whether this is the sense in which I mean the word to be understood here.* To this I must reply in the negative. And if "Inquirer" will go along with me a little in the examination, he will see the reason why I cannot admit this to be the right sense of the word.

It is an acknowledged principle, that if a definition or explanation of a word is right, that explanation may be substituted for the word, without injuring the sense. Now let the correctness of the above explanation be tested by this principle. Say then that the *cannot* in the cases referred to merely signifies, as Inquirer expresses it, that the thing spoken of is "very difficult, revolting or improbable;" and substitute any or all of these words in place of the Scripture word to be explained, and see how it will work. First, take the language of the prophet: "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? Then may ye also, who are accustomed to do evil, learn to do well." The passage clearly and strongly implies, that the Ethiopian *cannot* change his skin, or the leopard his spots, and that those who are accustomed to do evil *cannot* learn to do well. Try now the explanation above proposed. Begin with the word "difficult," thus: As it is "very difficult" for the Ethiopian to change his skin, and the leopard his spots so it is for those who are accustomed to do evil, to learn to do well. Next try "revolting:" As it is "very revolting" for the Ethiopian to change his skin—so it is for the habitual transgressor to turn from sin to holiness. Finally, try "improbable:" As it is "very *improbable*" that the Ethiopian will change his skin, so it is, that sinners, long accustomed to do evil, will learn to do well. Again: Take the text, John 15: 4, in which Christ says to some: "How *can* ye believe, who receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor which cometh from God only?" signifying emphatically, that such

persons *cannot* believe; and let it be explained as above. It is "very difficult" for them to believe, who receive honor one of another; or, it is "very revolting" to them; or it is "very improbable" that they will believe. Again: Take that momentous declaration of Christ: "No man can come unto me, except the Father who hath sent me draw him." As explained, it would read thus: It is "very difficult" for any man to come to Christ, except he is drawn of the Father; or it is "very revolting" to him; or it is "very improbable" that any sinner will come to Christ, without special divine influence. Again: "Without me ye can do nothing." Explained as above: It is "very difficult" for you to do any thing, or it is "very improbable" that you will do any thing, without me. Take one passage more, Rom. 8: 7, 8: "The carnal mind—is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Explained: It is "very difficult and revolting" for the carnal mind to be subject to the law, and it is "very improbable" that it ever will be subject.—"So then they that are in the flesh *cannot* please God." That is to say; it is "very difficult" for the unregenerate to please God, and "very improbable" that they will please him.

Perhaps I have said more than is necessary to show, that this first explanation proposed by "Inquirer," essentially fails to give the true meaning of the inspired writers. And he is perfectly right in thinking it "very improbable," that I understand the word *cannot* in such a sense.

"Inquirer" proceeds to suggest another view of the subject, namely: "that the unregenerate man has actually *no power* to love God and be subject to his law," and that it is "*actually and absolutely impossible*" for him to do it. He seems to suppose that this is the view which I adopt. And the reader will see how easy it is for him to make out a meaning for me, and to state it in his own words, and then to urge very plausible arguments against it, as though it were really entertained by me.

But I am not quite satisfied with this account of the matter. On such a subject it is important to use language which is unambiguous and plain. But the phrases, "*no power*," and "*actually and absolutely impossible*" are ambiguous, being used in very different senses, and there is certainly a wide difference between "*no power*" or total inability in one of these senses, and in the other. Who is

ignorant of the distinction, which is so obvious and so commonly recognised, between a *natural* inability and impossibility, and a *moral?* On this subject, I go with New England divines. I was trained up under their influence, and I do heartily, though not with an implicit, or undistinguishing faith, coincide with them in opinion. The explanations given by Edwards, Bellamy, Hopkins, Dwight and Day, particularly by Smalley, and also by Andrew Fuller, do, in my opinion, afford all the satisfaction which can be had, respecting the sinner's inability. It is indeed true, that a subtle and skeptical mind may embarrass this subject by endless objections and cavils. But after all, we shall find that every important truth respecting it is obvious and certain.

There is what we call a *natural inability,* consisting in the want of those powers and faculties which are essential to a moral, accountable agent, and without which there can be no obligation to obey the divine law. This inability belongs to inferior animals, and to those who are the subjects of total idiocy or insanity. But no inability of this kind can belong to sinners. They are not the subjects of it in any degree. The fact mentioned by "Inquirer," namely, that God requires all men to obey his commands, does most certainly imply that they *ought* to obey, and of course that they have no inability which interferes with the justice of such a requisition, or with their perfect obligation to comply with it. I am far from holding that sinners have "no power" of *any kind* to obey, or that it is, in *every sense,* "impossible" for them to obey. As to those powers and faculties, or that ability which makes them fit subjects of a moral law, I maintain that they possess it, I would not say in *some degree,* but *perfectly.* They have what goes to constitute obligation, as completely as though they were holy. So that they have no need of any new mental faculties, or any increase of their natural ability, in order to their actual obedience.

It follows, that when the Scriptures teach, that sinners *cannot* obey, they must refer to the other kind of inability. And here I come to the explanation which "Inquirer" calls for. The inability of sinners is their *strong disinclination* or *aversion* to *holiness;* their settled, unyielding unwillingness and opposition of heart to do the will of God. This sinful disinclination, unwillingness, or aversion is such, that

it is not sufficient to say, it makes it "very difficult" for sinners to obey, or "very improbable" that they will obey. It is a certain hinderance to obedience, and will be for ever, unless removed by the renewing of the Holy Ghost. No motives presented to the mind, and no means whatever can overcome it without the regenerating influence of the Spirit. It is a disinclination and aversion of heart so strong and invincible, that it prevents obedience as certainly and effectually, as a *natural impossibility* could; so that the sacred writers are perfectly justified in calling it a *cannot*, and in representing a change by the divine Spirit as absolutely necessary to bring man to faith and obedience. This is the doctrine of the New England divines; it is the doctrine of the Christian church in all ages; and what is still more important, it is the doctrine of THE BIBLE. Is not this view of the subject very clear? We know there is *a sense* in which sinners *cannot* obey, because the word of God so represents it. It must be an *important* sense, or the inspired writers would not have asserted it so often, and so emphatically. And it must be an *obvious* sense, plainly suggested by the very nature of the subject, or the inspired writers would not have asserted it so directly, and left it, without any qualification, to be apprehended by plain common sense. Considering the nature of the subject of which they are treating, and the drift of their discourse, we are sure this must be their meaning. And we are sure they had good reason to express this meaning just as they did, and to say, that unrenewed sinners *cannot* believe and obey. And as sinners are, in this respect, the same in all ages, *we* have good reason to speak of them as the sacred writers did. And when, with this moral aspect of the subject before us, we teach, in the very language of inspiration, that sinners cannot believe and obey, we no more furnish an excuse for their unbelief and disobedience, than Christ and the apostles did. Indeed, the more strongly we affirm this, in the proper connection, the more impressively do we teach the great and inexcusable wickedness of sinners. For the inability of sinners is of such a nature, that the higher it rises, and the more absolute it is, the more heinous is their guilt. And we may at any time make this perfectly plain, if instead of the word *cannot*, we merely employ other words, which clearly express the same meaning. Thus, if instead

of saying that sinners *cannot* believe and obey, we take words of the same import, and say, they are wholly *disinclined* to do it, that they have an absolute *aversion*, an obstinate *unwillingness* to obey, which no arguments can overcome, every one sees that we mean to charge them with great and inexcusable wickedness. To be *disinclined* to do what is right, and *inclined* to do wrong, is so far from furnishing an excuse, that it is the very essence of sin.

This then is the answer I give to the first question of "Inquirer," and it is the best answer I can give. If he is not satisfied with this; if he is not ready to admit that the sacred writers have good reason to affirm, that sinners *cannot* believe and obey, and that *we* have the same reason as they had to affirm it; and if he is not ready to admit, that it is the moral depravity or sinfulness of men, which constitutes the hinderance and the only hinderance to holy obedience; that this hinderance may justly be expressed as the sacred writers express it; and that to say that rational and moral beings *cannot* love God and obey his righteous law, is to represent them as exceedingly sinful, yea, desperately wicked; if he will not admit this, I know not on what principles I can argue the case with him, or how I can advance any thing that will conduce to his satisfaction.

But while we are, in the proper connection, to affirm that sinners cannot obey God; are we to affirm this in *all* cases, and whatever may be the drift of discourse? By no means. When it is our object to describe men as rational and accountable agents, and to show what necessarily belongs to them as the proper subjects of the divine law, we must represent them as endued with competent powers and faculties; in other words, with what New England divines call a *natural ability*, commensurate with the divine requirements; so that if they fail of obedience, it will not be for want of any of the requisite natural endowments. These endowments, these intellectual and moral faculties constitute the proper ground of obligation. When, with *such* an object in view, we say that man has *power* to do, or *can* do what God requires, we advance a truth of great importance, and virtually recognised by all.

On the other hand, it is not true, that sinners have in all respects an *ability* to keep the divine law, or that in *every* sense they *can* obey. There is an important sense in which

they *cannot* obey. Those who have been thoroughly convinced of sin know, by their own experience, that sinners *cannot* come to Christ, unless the Father draw them, and they know too in what the *inability* consists. Now when we are speaking of men in a religious point of view; when our object is to describe them *as sinners*, or to show what is their moral character and state, and to induce them to look to Christ for salvation; then truth requires us to use the language of the inspired writers, and to make the alarming, humbling representation, that sinners *cannot* believe, or do any thing spiritually good. Unless we tell sinners this, how do we tell them the whole truth? And if ministers of the gospel never tell sinners this, how do they conform to the infallible standard of God's word?

There is one point more to be considered, though it must be in few words. "Inquirer" asks, (p. 459,) whether the inability of an unsanctified man is such, "as precludes the possibility of his changing his present state for a better one." And if so, then he asks, what we are to say of the command, "make you a new heart, and a new spirit." I reply: This command, which is of the same import with the command to repent, or the command to turn from sin, is obligatory upon sinners, for the same reasons that all other moral precepts are. God's commands are all holy, just, and good; and they certainly do not cease to be binding upon us, because we are disinclined to obey, or because our disinclination is so strong and obstinate, that nothing but the renewing influence of the Spirit can remove it, and bring us to cordial obedience. Now it is clear, that we are under no other *inability* or *impossibility* to comply with the command to change from a sinful to a holy state, than the inability we are under in regard to all the other commands of God. It is an inability of a *moral kind*, consisting in the *entire depravity of the heart*, or *its total and invincible opposition to holiness*. When the command comes to sinners, requiring them to love God, or to believe in Christ, the wickedness of their hearts interposes and prevents. This is the *only* hinderance; but it is an *effectual* hinderance. And when the command comes to them, to repent, to turn from sin, or to make them a new heart, the same cause prevents. Tell me in what sense unregenerate sinners are unable to love God, or what *hinders* them from loving God,

and you at the same time tell me, in what sense they are unable "to change their present state for a better one," or what it is which *hinders* such a change. And that depravity or wickedness of heart, which has prevented and which now prevents them from obeying this and every other divine command, will certainly, in opposition to reason, conscience and duty, continue to prevent till the day of salvation ends, unless God is pleased to have mercy upon them, and *give* them a *new heart and a new spirit.*

[*To be continued.*]

ARTICLE XII.

Critical Notices.

1.—*History of American Missions to the Heathen, from their commencement to the present time.* Worcester: Spooner and Howland; 1840, pp. 818.*

The design of this work is concisely stated in the advertisement. "The want of a complete history of American Missions has been, for some time, extensively felt and generally acknowledged. The principal facts connected with their operations were, indeed, before the public; but were scattered through many volumes, such as the periodicals of the several societies, memoirs of individual missionaries, and accounts of single missions. Probably no private or public library contained all the printed works necessary to a full examination of the subject. It is the object of this work to bring the substance of all these publications within the compass of one volume of convenient size and moderate expense; supplying their deficiencies, reconciling their discrepancies and correcting their errors by reference to the original documents of the several missionary societies. For this purpose, several authors were engaged, each having the confidence of the Board whose history he was to prepare, and favored with

* We give the actual number of pages. In the copy which we have examined, pp. 528 to 620 are repeated.

access to its archives. The time expended on this work amounts to more than two entire years. The result of their labors is here submitted to the friends of missions and of general information, in the full belief that it will meet all reasonable expectations." After a careful perusal of the volume, we do not hesitate to say that it does "meet all reasonable expectations." It is all which it professes to be,—a full and faithful *history of American missions.*

The contents of the work are as follows: "1. History of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, compiled chiefly from the published and unpublished documents of the Board, by Rev. Joseph Tracy. 2. History of the missions of the Baptist General Convention, prepared under the superintendence of Rev. Solomon Peck, Foreign Secretary of the Board. 3. History of the Missions of the Methodist Episcopal church, by Rev. Enoch Mudge. 4. Missionary efforts of the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States, prepared from official documents, by William Cutter. 5. History of the Freewill Baptist Foreign Mission Society, by Rev. Enoch Mack, Corresponding Secretary. 6. History of the Board of Foreign Missions of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America, and of its Missions, by Rev. Joseph Tracy."

The history of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions is preceded by an introductory chapter, which gives a condensed and interesting view of Protestant Missions, previous to its formation. We wish it had been consistent with the plan of the work to present a more detailed account of the efforts which have been made—even from the first landing of the Pilgrims—to civilize and Christianize the Aborigines of this country. Our children, and our children's children will desire to know more—much more—about the pioneers in this goodly enterprise, than is now generally known. Materials, still in existence to satisfy this inquiry, may then be lost.

The history of the American Board, including the appendix, occupies 320 pages. It begins with Mills, Hall and Richards at Williams College, their seasons of fasting and prayer, and their secret Missionary Society. It gives a particular account of the formation of the Board at Bradford, June 29, 1810. It takes us to the perils by sea and the perils by land, which our first missionaries were called to encounter. It leads us on from this day of small things, to the present hour We close the book, our eyes fixed on the crowded chapels and the immense churches of the Sandwich Islands—and exclaim: "What hath God wrought!"

The preparation of this narrative has been a work of very great labor. As a collection of facts, it is invaluable. Indeed, it may be regarded as an *authority*. Unlike most of our histories of missions, it shows us what has been done at home as well as abroad. It makes us acquainted with the advance of missionary feeling in this country. It explains, with sufficient detail, the principles of the Board, and, to some extent, its plans for the future. At the same time, it traces, diligently and accurately, the progress of the respective missions. It states the difficulties which have embarrassed their movements, the reverses which have befallen some of them, and the success—in some instances, the triumphant success—which is now crowning their labors. To those who desire to understand the operations of the American Board, we recommend the present work as entitled to their implicit confidence. For the benefit of those friends of the Society who find themselves unable to purchase these collected histories of American missions, we will barely add, that the one of which we are now speaking is bound in a separate volume.

The history of the missions of the Baptist General Convention, occupying 268 pages, has been laboriously and carefully prepared. The account which it gives of the operations of the missionaries is somewhat more full than that of the American Board; but the interest is well sustained throughout the narrative. Some incidents, indeed, growing out of the mission at Burmah, possess the charm of high-wrought fiction. No one we think, can rise from the perusal of this portion of the volume, without the sincerest joy in view of what our Baptist brethren are doing in their wide and inviting field.

The number of the missionaries, now in the service of the Convention, is about 150. Their principal stations are in India, Burmah, Siam, China, Africa, France, and among the Aborigines of this country. They appear to be diligent and successful in their work. And it is gratifying to see that their labors are appreciated at home. The cause of missions has evidently gained a strong hold upon the Baptists in the United States.

The compilers of the shorter histories in this volume, occupying together 98 pages, have performed the duty assigned them with commendable fidelity. The account of the missions of the Methodist Episcopal church is introduced by a brief notice of the visit of Wesley to this country in 1736. It was not till 1768-9, that the first American Methodist church was built in the city of New-York. The first Missionary Society was formed a little more than twenty years ago. In May 1820,

it secured the approbation of the General Conference, and since that time it has been gradually and efficiently extending its operations. Its stations are among the American Indians, in South America, Texas and beyond the Rocky Mountains. This last mission is particularly promising. The receipts of the Society in 1820, were $803,04; in 1839, $135,521,94!

The Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal church was organized by the General Convention in 1820. At the Convention of 1835, the church undertook and agreed, in her character as a church, to carry on the work of Christian missions. The Society therefore became extinct. Within the last few years, the spirit of missions in this denomination has evidently become more vigorous and active. Stations are now sustained at Green Bay, Cape Palmas, Athens, Crete, Constantinople, China and Texas. Funds are in readiness for more extensive operations. Men only are wanted.

The Freewill Baptist Foreign Mission Society was organized in 1833. Its formation was owing, in a great measure, to the appeal of Rev. Mr. Sutton, then and now the missionary of the General Baptists of England at Orissa. Its first missionaries sailed from this country to India in 1835. It has no other station.

The Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian church was instituted in May, 1837. The missions, funds and all the concerns of the Western Foreign Missionary Society, which had been formed in 1836 by the Synod of Pittsburg, were immediately transferred to this Board. Its present stations are among the American Indians, in Africa, China and Northern India. The last is considered as offering great encouragment to missionary effort. It is the intention of the Board to make the mission to China extensive and efficient.

2.—*The History of Greece. By Thomas Keightley. To which is added, a chronological table of contemporary history. By Joshua Toulmin Smith, author of "Comparative view of Ancient History, and explanation of chronological eras."* Boston: Hilliard, Gray and Co. 1839, pp. 490.

3.—*The History of Rome. By Thomas Keightley, author of "the History of Greece," etc. To which is added, a chronological table of contemporary history. By Joshua Toulmin Smith, author of "Comparative view of Ancient History, and explanation of chronological eras."* Boston: Hilliard, Gray & Co.; 1839, pp. 480.

4.—*The History of England. By Thomas Keightley. Revised*

and edited, with notes and additions. By Joshua Toulmin Smith, author of "Comparative view of Ancient History, and explanation of chronological eras." In two volumes. Boston: Hilliard, Gray & Co.; 1840, pp. 552, 559.

When we began the preface to the first of the above named volumes, and found that the book was designed "to supply the want of a good History of Greece for schools," we had very serious misgivings as to its value. *A History for Schools*, in this country at least, is a very equivocal recommendation. But we soon discovered that the works of Mr. Keightley were something more than mere school-books. His idea of a popular epitome is, "that, while by clear, animated and graphic narrative it should interest the young, the views of society and of political measures and characters should be such, as not to be disdained even by the statesman." According to his view, therefore, the young are not alone to be considered: there is a very numerous class of grown persons who feel the want of sound historic knowledge, but have not time for reading voluminous works, and have a just contempt for the common school histories." For persons of this description likewise these volumes are prepared: indeed, we regard them as better suited to their use than to that of ordinary schools. They will also serve as a good introduction to our larger histories.

Mr. Smith, the American editor, says of Mr. Keightley, that "he generally gives the *facts* on each side with equal fairness and freedom, and his expressions of *opinion* in respect to agitated or party questions are usually equally unbiassed and independent." This remark, we think, does no more than simple justice to the author. With a few exceptions, some of which will be noticed hereafter, we find nothing to say against his candor and impartiality. Indeed, we have seldom met with a writer of history who succeeded so well in this particular. We are constrained to give him "credit for a love of justice and liberty, and a hatred of oppression and tyranny" under every form. He is equally unsparing toward the democracy of Athens, the oligarchy of Rome, and the *jure divino* pretensions of the Stuarts.

These volumes prove Mr. Keightley to be a man of extensive research and sound learning. He has not been content with reading Goldsmith, Gillies, Ferguson, Hume, Henry, Smollett, etc. He has traversed the whole field, and brought to his aid the discoveries of the best writers, ancient and modern. There is sometimes a greater display of erudition than

is required by the subject. Occasional mistakes are committed in reference to minor points; as where he says: "*Consul* means merely *colleague*, for, as in exul, praesul, the syllable *sul* denotes *one who is*." Still we have the satisfaction of feeling that we are in the company of one who is not a mere tyro in these matters. His style is generally good. It is concise, clear, nervous and animated; and hence, it is well suited to works like the present. We have noticed an occasional want of simplicity, and the too frequent introduction of words which are not *English*. We refer to such as the following: *atimy*, *timocracy*, *proxeny*, *dokimasy*, *cury*, *praeluder*, *fetials*, *medism*, *phyles*, *consular*, (as a noun,) *epitomator*, (instead of epitomist or epitomizer.) We earnestly protest against every such encroachment on the purity of our mother tongue.

In writing the History of Greece Mr. Keightley was greatly assisted by a careful study of Müller, Heeren, Böckh and Wachsmuth among the Germans, and Mitford, Arnold and Clinton among the English. He does not give us "Plutarch's men," the heroes and patriots whom we admired and loved in our boyhood. He makes the republics of Athens, Sparta, etc., something widely different from what we once thought them. But he does them simple, evenhanded justice. He dispels the illusions of poetry, and substitutes what we regard as the sober truth.

The History of Rome gives, in the first place, the usual account of the origin and growth of the city, previous to its destruction by the Gauls. But the author adopts the theory of Pouilly, Levesque and others, and, consequently, considers this portion of the Roman annals as mainly fabulous. He therefore presents the narrative of Niebuhr, and leaves the reader to make his election between them. His view of the struggle between the rich and the poor, though less favorable to the former than the latter, is generally correct.

The American editor, speaking of the History of England, makes the following remarks: "Throughout the whole work, Mr. Keightley exhibits exalted and noble views of constitutional independence; his account of the Stuarts is admirable; and his summary of the struggles of the spirit of the nation with the assumed prerogative of the monarch is, perhaps, the best that has ever appeared. It may be expected, perhaps, that much of the account of the American revolution would require considerable alteration. Such has not been the case. The spirit of the narrative, on that point, is candid, liberal, and just." We regard this high commendation as generally deserved. But the editor thinks that there is a lack of

impartiality in the author's account of "the influence and deeds of the church of Rome and her followers;" "the merits of Queen Elizabeth, and her conduct towards Mary, Queen of Scots;" and "some of the more recent demonstrations of public opinion in Britain." His thrust at the Dissenters (vol. 2, p. 524) is unworthy of the dignified and candid historian. Though far from wishing to become the advocate of Mary, Queen of Scots, we should have preferred a more decided censure of the hypocrisy of Elizabeth. But we are not sure that Mr. Keightley's remarks respecting the church of Rome need any very marked qualification.

5.—*Medical and Physiological Commentaries. By Martyn Paine, M. D. A. M. In two volumes.* New-York: Collins, Keese and Co. London: John Churchill; 1840, pp. 716, 815.

[As this work has quite recently come into our hands, and embraces a great variety of subjects and reasonings, with which we cannot be supposed to be familiar, a medical friend, on whose competency and good judgment we rely, and who has thoroughly examined the work, has, at our solicitation, prepared the following notice.]

Few perhaps are aware, that one of our fellow citizens, the much respected author of the above work, has found time, amidst the arduous duties of active professional life, to accomplish a literary undertaking, which for extent of research, vigor of thought and ingenuity of reasoning, has certainly no parallel in this country. We rejoice to find that the author's labours are properly appreciated by his professional brethren; and we feel assured that they will not go unrewarded. The work, however, commends itself, not only to the attention of the physician, but also to the student of general science, and it abounds in discussions of an interesting nature to all. It embraces a critical survey of all the great doctrines in physiology and medicine, and is made up of a series of monographs, possessing mutual relations, which are so interwoven, that each is made to borrow light from the other. The principal subjects treated of are, *the Vital Powers*, *Philosophy of the Operation of Loss of Blood*, *the Humoral Pathology*, *Philosophy of Animal Heat*, *Philosophy of Digestion*, *Theories of Inflammation*, *Philosophy of Venous Congestion*, *Comparative Merits of the Hippocratic and Anatomical schools*, *the Principal Writings of P. Ch. A. Louis*, *M. D.* It seems to have been one of the leading objects of Dr. Paine to establish principles

in medicine; and with this view, he has taken the Baconian Philosophy as his guide, and extended his inquiries over the whole field of the art. He condemns all speculative philosophy, and, in a general sense, whenever he undertakes the exposure of error, he avails himself, for this purpose, of the very facts upon which the hypothesis is founded. In all his essays, we find the utmost candor and fairness; indeed there is a degree of particularity which is quite uncommon, in referring to the exact page of the author quoted; and however severe his criticism, there is a vein of generosity pervading it, which seems almost to blunt its edge. Although our prescribed limits do not allow us to give an extended notice of this work, yet we may add that we have perused it with high gratification and profit. The style is distinguished for terseness, vigor and elegance, and will compare with the very best works of the kind in the language. The author aims at instruction and practical utility, by settling the most important mooted points in physiology and medicine; and, as these lie at the foundation of the healing art, it will readily be seen that he could not have addressed himself to an undertaking of greater magnitude.

It is not to be expected, however, that Dr. Paine will escape criticism. In some of his observations in relation to the microscope he manifests a degree of skepticism as to the results attained by it, which will not satisfy those naturalists who have employed it extensively in their researches, and have looked upon it as of equal importance in the minute creation, with the telescope in astronomy. None can deny that the essay on this subject is a masterly exhibition of ingenuity and learning; and those who reject the conclusions at which the author arrives, must admire the humor and the skill everywhere displayed. Again: his bold attack upon the writings of M. Louis, the founder of what is called the "numerical school," must call forth the friends of that popular author in his defence; and we shall not be disappointed to find the translators and proprietors of his works undertaking a reply. One thing must be acknowledged; Dr. Paine has indulged in no denunciation, or wholesale terms of censure; but has given his objections *in extenso*, carefully quoting, or referring to every paragraph and sentence under review, that the reader may be able to decide for himself as to the fairness or strength of the criticism. He has, it is true, generally taken the American translation as his authority; and has given his reasons for so doing. Should it eventually appear, that he has been led by it, in some instances, into unintentional error, not affecting, in the least, the merits of his argument, the translator must

be responsible, as it is presumed that he has given the meaning of his author correctly. If he has not done so, he has undertaken a task for which he was not qualified, and which he should have resigned to abler hands. There are some other portions of the work, which will provoke attack; but they are unimportant. It must be passed upon as a whole. As such we commend it to our readers as eminently meritorious, imbued with the true spirit of philosophy, abounding in fact, argument, illustration and learning,—in short, as worthy of the highest commendation and praise.

6.—*History of the Christian Church, from the Ascension of Jesus Christ, to the conversion of Constantine. By the Rev. Edward Burton, D. D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford. First American edition; with a Memoir of the Author, occasional Notes and Questions adapting it to the use of Schools and Colleges, by the Rt. Rev. G. W. Doane, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese of New Jersey, and Principal of St. Mary's Hall.* New-York: Wiley & Putnam; 1839. pp. 407.

Dr. Burton is extensively known in England as the author of several valuable works on the Early History of the Church. In 1826, he published his "testimony of the Anti-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ." In 1829, he delivered the Bampton Lectures before the University of Oxford, on "the heresies of the apostolic age." In 1831, he published his "testimony of the Anti-Nicene Fathers to the doctrine of the Trinity and the Divinity of the Holy Ghost." In 1833, his "Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the three first centuries, from the crucifixion of Jesus Christ to the year 313," were given to the public. The present volume is an abridgment of the last named work. It was prepared at the request of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge. It was among the last acts of his life; indeed, his earthly labors closed a few weeks before it issued from the press.

The reader will not expect from this abridgement the profound and copious learning of our larger histories. It is written, not for the scholar, but the *people*. It gives us a general view of a most interesting period in the affairs of the church; but there is very little of detail, and there is no display of the author's erudition. There is hardly a quotation from the Fathers and it is seldom that any reference is made to the sources from which his statements are drawn. Still it is obvious

that Dr. B., throughout the volume, feels himself very much at home. His silence on some points. and his hasty glance at others are evidently the result of design, and not of incompetency. We are not sure that his plan is not faulty in this particular. We are inclined to think that his desire to suit his work to the general reader has carried him too far.

In the execution of his plan, the author has been very successful. In his style there is a happy blending of grace with precision. His recital of facts is generally correct: vexed questions and disputed points are presented with clearness and candor.

In proof of Dr. Burton's fairness we refer the reader to p. 60. He there says: "Jesus Christ had not himself left any directions for governing his church." This is more than we expected from the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. The editor, however, has endeavored to neutralize this concession by the following note: "This seems hardly in accordance with what is said in Acts i. 3: 'Being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God,' and with the very particular directions for the government of the church which we find in St. Paul's Epistles to the bishops Timothy and Titus." In a second note on the same page (61) he says: "His final commission to them, (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20,) was, 'Go ye and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you.' A most pregnant clause, this last; and evidently implying many instructions to the apostles which are not recorded."

We cannot doubt that Dr. Burton's attention was called to Acts i. 3, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, and "the very particular directions" "in St. Paul's Epistles to the bishops Timothy and Titus." It would readily occur to him, however, that if any unrecorded instructions were given to the apostles, designating an order of men to be their successors, the fruit of this appointment must appear in the practice of the primitive church. But he says, page 262: "Every church had its own spiritual head or bishop, and was independent of every other church, with respect to its own internal regulations. There was, however, a connexion, more or less intimate, between neighboring churches, which was a consequence, in some degree, of the geographical or civil divisions of the empire. Thus the churches of one province, as Achaia, Egypt, Cappadocia, etc., formed a kind of union, and the bishop of the capital, particularly if his see happened to be of apostolic foundation,

required a precedence in rank and dignity over the rest. This superiority was often increased by the bishop of the capital, (who was called, in later times, the metropolitan,) having actually planted the church in smaller and more distant places; so that the mother church, as it might literally be termed, continued to feel a natural and parental regard for the churches planted by itself. These churches, however, were wholly independent in matters of internal jurisdiction." And this at the close of the second century! We think the author was perfectly justified in saying, that "Jesus Christ had not himself left any directions for governing the church."

7.—*Critical and Miscellaneous Essays. By Thomas Babington Macauley. In two volumes.* Boston: Weeks, Jordan & Co.; 1840, pp. 456, 496.

The author of these essays is the son of Zachary Macauley, who is favorably known, in England and this country, as a former editor of the Christian Observer. It is now many years since T. B. Macauley engaged in public life; and his career thus far has been very successful. He has occupied a high judicial station in the East;—has been a prominent member of Parliament; and now holds the office of Secretary of the War Department, in the British Ministry. His fame, however, will ultimately settle down on his literary labors. The writer of the essay on Milton will be admired and praised, long after the judge at Calcutta, the member from Edinburgh and the associate of Lord Melbourne shall have ceased to be mentioned. There is a grasp of thought and a vigor of expression in his productions, which are the sure pledge of immortality. When once read, they can never be forgotten. His vivid conceptions and his breathing eloquence haunt the memory, like a spirit-stirring tale.

These essays—sixteen in number—have all appeared in the Edinburgh Review. The first was published in 1825; the last in 1837. The subjects are happily chosen; they give full scope to the peculiar, and, in some respects, unequalled power of the writer; and their bare announcement arrests and chains the attention of every intelligent reader. Bacon, Hampden, Milton, Dryden, Chatham, Johnson and John Bunyan are men whom the world must always delight to honor. To the names of Machiavelli, Byron, Burghley, Mirabeau and Horace Walpole an interest of another sort adheres. With different shades of depravity, as well as different degrees of talent, we find too much to loathe and abhor in them all.

And yet they are men, in respect to whom curiosity is always awake. The heart sickens, ever and anon, at the detail of their vices or their crimes; still, the eye returns to the picture, as by a charm which it cannot break. The lessons of wisdom, to be drawn from a skilful analysis of such characters, are many and precious.

The remaining subjects of these essays are *History, Southey's Colloquies on Society, Lord Mahon's War of the Succession in Spain, and Hallam's Constitutional History.* All are discussed with great ability. The whole series, indeed, displays an extent and variety of learning, a richness and fulness of illustration, with a mastery of our good old Saxon English, which, in their happy combination, are no where else surpassed. We commend them to all who love thought, taste and eloquence. They should be read not only, but diligently and carefully studied.

8.—*Collections of the Rhode-Island Historical Society.* Vol. IV. Providence: Knowles, Vose & Co.; 1838. pp. 272.

It is but lately that we have been favored with the perusal of this truly valuable publication. It is replete with interesting details of the history and peculiar trials of the early settlers of Rhode Island;—a little state it is true, but the events which marked its beginning were so interwoven with all that occurred in the neighborhood of the landing of the Pilgrims, and along the coast of New England, during the first years of our colonial existence, that the record of them belongs, not to the people of that state alone, but to the whole country. They are among the most precious materials of early American history.

This volume is composed of a Preface by the committee of publication, and "An Historical Discourse, on the civil and religious affairs of the Colony of Rhode-Island; by John Callender, M. A.; with a memoir of the author; biographical notices of some of his distinguished contemporaries; and annotations and original documents, illustrative of the history of Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations, from the first settlement to the end of the first century; by Romeo Elton, M. A., F. S. U. S., etc. Prof. Lat. and Gr. Lit., Brown University."

Mr. Callender's discourse was delivered in Newport, March 24, 1738, just one hundred years after the Indian Sachems signed the deed or grant of the land afterwards possessed by

the Colony of Rhode-Island. It is a faithful and highly instructive narrative of the events of the intervening century. The rest of the volume, compiled by Prof. Elton, is rich in illustrations of the history of those times We have been especially interested in the evidence given in these collections, of the liberal sentiments of the early Baptists in this country on the subject of open communion. In the *Church Covenant* of the first *Baptist church* gathered in the province of Massachusetts, it is declared: "That union to Christ was the sole ground of their communion with each other, and that they were ready to accept of, receive to, and hold church communion with, all such, as in a judgment of charity, were fellow members with them in their head Christ Jesus, though differing in such controversial points, as are not absolutely and essentially necessary to salvation." Accordingly they were accustomed to invite the Congregational churches to unite with them in the ordination of their ministers and in other acts of communion. Mr. Callender urges these usages upon the Baptists of his time in a discourse preached in Boston, 1738.

It is known to many of our readers that Dean Berkeley, afterwards Bishop of Cloyne, the author of the "*Minute Philosopher*," etc., resided some time in this country. In a letter of his to a friend in Dublin, dated Newport, R. I. April 24, 1729, occurs the following remarkable account of a town, which appears to have been as large 111 years ago, as at the present time. "The town of Newport contains about six thousand souls, and is the most thriving place in all America for bigness. It is very pretty and pleasantly situated."

9.—*Elementary Geology. By Edward Hitchcock, Professor of Chemistry and Natural History in Amherst College, and Geologist to the State of Massachusetts.* Amherst: J. S. and C. Adams; 1840, pp. 329.

The science of Geology has, for many years, excited much interest in different countries of Europe. The first of European philosophers have pronounced it to be second to Astronomy only, "in the magnitude and sublimity of the objects of which it treats." It has lately attracted much attention among us. Full courses of lectures are given upon it in all the best of our colleges. Popular lectures on this subject are eagerly sought for in our cities and large towns. Geological surveys have been instituted by the governments in most of the states, and nearly or quite completed in some of them.

The results of these have given to this science an economical importance beyond that of almost any other. And while these facts are an evidence of the degree of interest in the subject which already exists, they also tend, at the same time, to excite a still greater one. Under these circumstances, the appearance of this volume from the pen of Professor Hitchcock will be peculiarly gratifying to many in the community.

This work, like that of Dr. Lee, noticed in our April No., is designed to be used as a Text-Book for classes in Geology, in colleges and other seminaries of learning, and, also, to supply the wants of the general reader, who has not the leisure to study the numerous and extended treatises that have been written on different branches of this subject. The plan of it, we think, is admirably adapted to the first of these uses, and nearly or quite as well suited to the second. It enables the author to give a full, and, at the same time, a very condensed view of the facts, theories and hypotheses of the science, together with its religious, historical and geographical relations. One of the peculiarities of this work consists in the abundant references which it contains. These answer as an index to all the valuable works which have been written on subjects connected with Geology, and will very much facilitate the labors of those who wish to make extended investigations in the science. More than a hundred wood-cuts are inserted, illustrative of the structure of the earth and the reasonings of the science. It is, also, ornamented by a *Palaeolontological Chart* inserted as a frontispiece, the object of which is, "to bring under a glance of the eye the leading facts respecting organic remains." We will only add concerning the contents of the work, that one whole chapter, out of the eleven into which it is divided, treats of the connection between Geology and Revealed Religion. It forms a valuable summary of the various arguments and reasonings that have been advanced on this interesting topic.

We are sorry we cannot speak favorably of the manner in which this work is got up. Besides numerous typographical errors, the paper and print are of an inferior quality, and the wood-cuts are not well executed.

10.—*German Literature, translated from the German of Wolfgang Menzel. By C. C. Felton, Professor in Harvard University. In three volumes.* Boston: Hilliard, Gray & Co., 1840.

These volumes form the seventh, eighth and ninth in Mr.

Ripley's Specimens of Foreign Standard Literature. This series of books is handsomely printed, and, what is far more uncommon, well translated. Mr. Ripley, the translator of the earlier volumes, is an accomplished scholar in the modern languages. Professor Felton is the well known and able editor of Homer's Iliad, and is a frequent and popular writer in our principal periodicals. So far as we have examined the translation of the volumes of Menzel, we find the work done with remarkable tact, spirit and adroitness. The translator acknowledges his obligations to his friends, Professors Beck and Longfellow, for their kindness in helping him over the difficulties of his undertaking.

The author of these entertaining volumes, Wolfgang Menzel was born at a village in Silesia, June 21, 1798. He studied philosophy at the Universities of Jena and Bonn. In 1825 he formed a connexion at Stuttgard with the great bookseller Cotta. In 1823, he was elected a member of the legislature. He first made himself known to the literary world by some poems, published in 1823. His history of Germans appeared in 1827. A second edition in one large volume was issued in 1834. His work on German literature, published in 1828, gave a brilliant proof of the originality and universality of his intellectual powers. This work has been very well received in England, and been strongly commended by the most respectable periodical publications there. One English critic compares the author to Burke; and one of his own countrymen said of him, that he wrote like an Englishman. "He is, undoubtedly," remarks his translator, "a writer of extraordinary vigor and clearness, and his style occasionally rises to eloquence. His power of illustrating his ideas by the ornaments of fancy is almost unrivalled." On the other hand, he is often careless; he sometimes descends to coarseness and vulgarity. He occasionally allows the violence of party feeling to blind his better judgment. What he says of Voss and Goethe must be taken with no inconsiderable deductions. Against the last writer he maintains a vigorous and most unrelenting warfare. He denounces with a bitter pen, the idolatry with which almost all Germany have worshipped the "many-sided," though by no means "the most distinguished" man of his age. The moral character of neither Schiller nor Goethe, we fear, will stand a very close examination; though the latter, doubtless, is the more guilty. What Menzel says of his political offences needs large qualifications. The fine criticism, however, will amply repay a perusal. Menzel brandishes alike a heavy claymore and a keen scimetar. He can knock down with the

ponderous blow of Ajax, and wound with a fatal elegance and a practised adroitness.

The religious reader will find not a few things in these volumes for which he will thank the author. Menzel has no patience with the cold hearted neologists around him. The religion of Germany wants *fire*. It is learned, but heartless. It is simple, soothing, flattering, but inefficient. The preachers are not clothed with the terrors of the Almighty. They ought to sound an *alarm* in God's holy mountain.—Such advice, coming from a layman of keen wit, of splendid talents and wide acquisitions, must be felt. The hatred which it has aroused is proof enough that the shots are not at random.

The volumes will furnish one important contribution to our materials for estimating the German character aright. We have the full verdict of a German in the premises:—a verdict too which is, perhaps, as impartial as could be expected. We have been far too ready to condemn the Germans by wholesale, to laugh at them without any discrimination; or else, which is a more rare case, applaud them too inordinately.

11.—*Introduction to the French Language; comprising a French Grammar, with an Appendix of Important Tables and other matter; and a French Reader, consisting of Selections from the Classic Literature of France, accompanied by Explanatory Notes, and a Vocabulary adapted to the Selections. By David Fosdick, jr.* Andover and New-York: Gould, Newman and Saxton; 1840. pp. 402.

The principal difficulty in the French grammars which we have attempted to study, is their plethoric fulness. They were made by Frenchmen for Frenchmen. We can imimagine scarcely any thing so preposterous, as that we should undertake to write an English grammar for Germans and Frenchmen. We should not meet their wants; we might, indeed, say something about the pronounciation of the *s* and the *th*, or the enormous or rather *ab*normous character of some of our verbs; but, on the other hand, we should multiply superfluous remarks and be guilty of manifold deficiencies. We do not understand the French idiosyncrasy, or what a Frenchman considers to be the knotty points in our language. Wanostrocht's French grammar is a perfect wilderness. To the eye of the tyro, at least, it is an inextricable labyrinth of rules, exceptions, exercises, criticisms, etc., without any clear, typographical divisions.

Mr. Fosdick has avoided this serious embarrassment both in his German and French grammars. The typographical arrangement is distinct. The pages are not encumbered with useless or less important matters. Their appearance is inviting. The author has not introduced exercises for practice in writing French, because a grammar does not appear to be a very suitable repository for such exercises. The learner will do better by translating some easy French into English, and when he has forgotten the words of the original text, he should re-translate the English into French. The grammar of Mr. Fosdick occupies about three-fourths of the volume. About fifty pages are taken up with selections from French literature, and the same number of pages with the vocabulary. The lessons are firm standard writers, such as Boileau, Rousseau, Pascal, Fenelon, Montesquieu, De Sevigne, Condorcet, Maury, La Harpe, Lamartine, Bossuet, Massillon, etc. The selections have been made especially from those authors who furnish a convenient opportunity of presenting entire pieces, or, at least, extracts not unintelligible when withdrawn from their connection. There are various explanatory notes which refer to principles in the grammar by which they are illustrated. A somewhat minute account is very properly given of French pronunciation. This is one of the principal obstacles which a foreigner meets in acquiring the language. Upon a prominent peculiarity of the grammar—the incorporation of the syntax with an account of the etymology, or of the forms of words,—we do not feel authorized to pronounce an opinion.

12.—*Views of the Architecture of the Heavens. In a series of letters to a Lady. By J. P. Nichol, L. L. D., F. R. S. E., Prof. of Practical Astronomy in the University of Glasgow. Republished from the last London and Edinburg Editions: to which has been added Notes, and a Glossary, etc. by the American publishers.* New-York: H. A. Chapin & Co.; 1840, pp. 138.

The wonderful discoveries of Modern Astronomy claim the attention of all classes. Though intensely interesting to the man of science, they can be clothed in a popular form. In proof of this we have only to appeal to the work before us. While most of these discoveries, particularly those revealed by the late researches in firmamental nebulæ are confined to learned and elaborate treatises, this volume, the publishers justly remark, "is indited in plain but glowing and elevated language, comprehended by, and alike inspiring to all." The author takes us into the very centre of the mighty frame-

work of the universe; and makes us acquainted with those distant bodies—majestic and awful for their vastness—which are known to us only as *nebulæ*. Those who have paid the least attention to the science of Astronomy will have no difficulty in following Prof. Nichol; and they may hereafter look at the heavens with something of the feelings of the accomplished Astronomer.

We rejoice that the execution of this plan has fallen into such hands. The eminent talents of the author, and his experience as a practical Astronomer would lead us to expect a work like the present. Few could have prepared one so interesting, and at the same time so trustworthy.

It is due to the publishers to add, that the maps and plates are beautifully executed; the notes and glossary, by Mr. Chapin, have been diligently prepared.

13.—*An Exposition of the Law of Baptism, as it regards the Mode and the Subjects. By Edwin Hall, A. M., Pastor of the First Congregational Church, Norwalk, Connecticut.* Norwalk: John A. Weed. New-York: Gould, Newman & Saxton, 1840. pp. 216—18 mo.

This little volume is composed of four discourses, written, as the author states, for the defence of the truth in his own congregation. They are characterized by great energy and directness. On the mode of baptism the author begins with stating the principles of interpretation, which he thinks adapted to settle the controversy. The first of these he illustrates, by citing the following example from "Blackstone's Commentaries." "A law of Edward III. forbids all ecclesiastical persons to purchase *provisions* at Rome." "This law," says Blackstone, "might seem to prohibit the buying of *grain* and other *victuals:* but when we consider that the statute was made to repress the usurpations of the Papal See, and that *nominations to benefices by the Pope* were called *provisions*, we shall see that the restraint is intended to be laid on *such* provisions only."

This, Mr. Hall assumes as the leading principle of his reply to the reasoning of our Baptist brethren, who maintain that the meaning of *βαπτίζω* in classical Greek, must govern its meaning in the New Testament, and as applied to the Christian ordinance of baptism. As Blackstone would have us search out the meaning of "*provisions*," as used in the canon law of those days, so our author takes us to Christ and his apostles for the meaning of *baptize*. "The decision of Blackstone," he says, "carries all common sense with it. Away go

the hundred dictionaries and the ten thousand quotations from the Classics. No matter how many times it may have been 'conceded' that the word *provisions* commonly means *something to eat*, Blackstone himself makes the same concession, and still maintains his interpretation of the law."

The author's general views accord with those of President Beecher, in the Repository, as to the import of the word *βαπτίζω*, but he has evidently studied the subject for himself, and has succeeded in presenting his arguments in a condensed and highly popular form. On this subject, as well as that of Infant Baptism, he meets objections with adroitness, and with a candor and openness which command the respect of the reader. The book is worthy of an extensive circulation.

14.—*Arguments, derived from Sacred Scripture and sound Reason, exhibiting the Necessity and Advantages of Infant Baptism; and proving Sprinkling or Affusion to be the most Scriptural and appropriate mode of administering it; together with a number of Essays on important subjects connected with Baptism. By Benjamin Kurtz, D. D.* Baltimore Publication Rooms, 1840; pp. 370.

Dr. Kurtz is a clergyman of the Lutheran church, and has prepared the volume above named in compliance with a "Resolution" of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Maryland. We do not hesitate to say, he has honored the choice of his brethren. It was his aim "to concentrate the largest possible amount of conclusive evidence and useful information, within the narrowest limits." This he has accomplished with admirable success. The work is divided into three parts, entitled, 1. *Baptism in General.* 2. *Benefits of Infant Baptism.* 3. *The Mode of Baptism.* The discussions under these general heads are divided into *forty* chapters on a succession of topics, which are so arranged as to present the whole subject of Baptism, explained and illustrated, to the mind of the reader. The Scriptural constitution of the church,—the design and use of baptism as a sacrament and a token of church membership,—the command of Christ respecting it,—the numerous passages of Scripture which cannot be consistently explained without admitting the right of infant baptism,—the ancient practice of family baptism, continued in the Apostolic age,—the practice of the Christian church from the earliest period, etc. etc., are presented in a manner which does great credit to the candor and faithfulness of the author and to the competency of his biblical and historical learning. To the defence

of sprinkling or affusion as a proper mode of baptism about one half of the volume is devoted. The philological arguments from the import of *βαπτίζω*, as used in the New Testament and by the Christian fathers, is ably conducted. Every important objection to the author's positions throughout the book is considered. On the whole we regard this as one of the best discussions of the whole subject which we have seen. The subjects of the additional essays, embraced in an appendix, are "Names given in Baptism, Sponsors, Confirmation, Baptismal Regeneration, and the action of the Westminster Assembly in respect to Baptism.

15.—*A History of the Rise, Progress, Genius, and Character of American Presbyterianism: together with a Review of "The Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.; by Chas. Hodge, D. D., Prof. in Theol. Sem. Princeton, N. J." By William Hill, D. D. of Winchester, Va.* Washington City, 1839; pp. 224.

The above is the title of a work now, as we understand, in the process of preparation. The first No. only is published. In this respect the author has adopted the order pursued by Prof. Hodge, who is also preparing, in Nos., a history of the Presbyterian Church. But in numerous facts and authorities Dr. Hill is at variance with the statements of the latter writer. Some ten years since, it appears, and before the late divisive measures were thought of, Dr. Hill commenced his researches, with great zeal, preparatory to his contemplated history. To excite interest in the subject, and to elicit further information from such as might possess it, he occasionally communicated facts and statements to the southern papers, in respect to the origin and early usages of Presbyterianism in this country, which were quite inconsistent with the claims on which were based the "Exscinding Acts" of 1837—8. In the mean time the history by Dr. Hodge was commenced, and our author, finding his main positions assailed in the latter work, has been driven to a new and more thorough search for documents, and a re-examination of facts and statements, in respect to which he had supposed all would agree. The result is the commencement, in the No. before us, of a history which promises to be more rich in materials, and better guarded against hasty and unsupported positions, than might otherwise have been expected. The portion already published is chiefly documentary, and contains much that is curious and interesting, not to Presbyterians only, but to all

who find pleasure in looking back, from the heights to which our churches have been raised in number and privilege, to the "small things" of their beginning. We hope the venerable author will be encouraged to proceed in his useful undertaking. By age and experience, he is perhaps better qualified for the task he has assumed than any man to be found in the church of which he is an honored and able minister; and no one possesses more of that candor and fairness which fit a man to write the history of his own times.

16.—*An Historical and Descriptive Account of British America; comprehending Canada, Upper and Lower, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, the Bermudas and the Fur Countries; their history from the earliest settlement; their statistics, topography, commerce, fisheries, etc.; and their social and political condition; as also an account of the manners and present state of the aboriginal tribes. By Hugh Murray, F. R. S. E. In two volumes.* New-York: Harper and Brothers; 1840, pp. 312, 290.

These volumes are worthy of a place in *the Family Library.* The promise of the title-page is kept; and we know of no work which presents so just a picture of British America. The first volume is devoted exclusively to Canada. The topics discussed are as follows: *General view of Canada; the native Indians; its history under the French; its history under the British; and its social and political state.* The chapter on "the history of Canada under the British" is, in many respects, the most interesting, and yet it is the least satisfactory. The account which it gives of the war of 1812, and the struggles to which it led on our northern frontier, is evidently colored. The notice of the origin and progress of the late difficulties in the administration of Lower Canada, hardly does justice to the subject.

The topics of the second volume are as follows: *a general view of the maritime provinces; general description, history, social and political state of Nova Scotia; New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island; Newfoundland; Bermudas; early discovery, settlement, recent discoveries and present state of Hudson's Bay Territory; general Summary.* The reader will here find much that is instructive and new, on subjects which are too little understood. The style of the work is chaste, easy and dignified. The descriptive part is particularly well executed.

17.—*A Letter to the Editor of the American Biblical Repository, containing Remarks upon a Paper in that Work, by Professor Stuart, on Original Sin. By George Payne, LL. D. Exeter, (Eng.)* London, 1839, pp. 20.

This *Letter*, as appears from the author's Preface, was intended for the pages of our work, "that the individuals who had read Mr. Stuart's statements might have an opportunity of perusing the present writer's remarks upon them." Had it been furnished us previous to its publication, we would gladly have inserted it.

The *Paper* referred to, *on Original Sin*, was published in the Repository for April and July, 1839; and we were not aware that it had been replied to in England, until the above Letter, with which Dr. Payne has been pleased to honor us, was received, near the first of June, 1840, six months after the date of its publication, and quite too late to find a place in our last No. This statement is made as due to those of our English readers, who, having read Dr. P.'s. *Remarks*, may have expected to see them republished by us. The respected author, however, has kindly assured us that, after so long a delay of their transmission, he could not expect them to appear on our pages, excepting in the form of a notice. But we should regret to dispose of so respectable a production, addressed to ourselves, by a bare announcement of its reception; and as we do not care to engage personally in this discussion, we have submitted the Letter to Professor Stuart, the state of whose health, during the last three months, has not allowed him to give it his attention. Should he favor us with further remarks on the subject, we shall probably accompany them with the publication of the substance of Dr. Payne's pamphlet. For this reason we give no account of his argument in the present notice, and only add the expression of our pleasure in the candor and courtesy with which he has conducted it.

Nordheimer's Grammar.

We take pleasure in being able to announce that the long expected second volume of Dr. Nordheimer's Hebrew Grammar, which treats of the Syntax, is now rapidly advancing towards completion. On account of the fulness with which every topic is discussed, it will form, probably, a volume larger than the first. It will be published in November.

INDEX TO VOLUME IV.

A.

Adams, Rev. Nehemiah, Letter to Gannett, noticed 263.

Allen, Rev. William, D. D. on the designations of time in Daniel and John 35.

American Board of Com. for Foreign Missions, history of, noticed 485.

American Missions to the heathen, History of 485

Ancient Christianity and the Oxford Tracts, by Taylor, noticed 248.

Asia, Western, Ancient Commerce of 310.

Aspect and position of the Missionary enterprise 54.

Augustinism and Pelagianism, by Wiggers, noticed 247.

B.

Baptism, by Dr. Kurtz, noticed 503.

Baptism, Law of, by Hall noticed 502.

Baptist General Convention, history of the Missions of, noticed 485.

Baptists, Freewill, History of the Foreign Mission Society of, noticed 485.

Barnes, Rev. Albert, on the Ancient Commerce of Western Asia 310.

Beecher, Pres. on Baptism, noticed 264.

British America, history of, by Murray noticed 505.

Burton, Rev. Edward, D. D. History of the Christian Church, noticed 493.

C.

Callender, Rev. John, Historical Discourse on the Colony of Rhode Island, noticed 496.

Calman, E. S. on the present state of the Jewish religion, concluded 176.

Campbell, Alex. on Campbellism, replied to by Landis 203. Mr. C.'s charges examined 203. Mr. C. on Faith, replied to 204 On remission of sins 206. Regeneration and immersion 207. Mr. C.'s creed 208. Unitarianism of the Campbellites 209. Absurdity of Mr. C.'s definition of Unitarianism 211. His translation of the New Testament 213.

Cause and Effect in connexion with fatalism and free agency 217 — Same subject continued 467.

Cheever, Rev. George B., on the aspect and position of the Missionary enterprise in the Oriental world 54.

Cheever, Henry T. on the Gnostics 353.

Commerce, the Ancient, of Western Asia 310. Interest in Palestine 311. Prophecies 312. Babylon the seat of Empire 313, and of Commerce 314. Spices and aromatics 315. Embalming 316.— Burning the dead 319. Precious stones 320. Gold and silk 321. Ivory 323. Chief marts of Commerce 324. Babylon as a place of Commerce 324. Tadmor or Palmyra 326. Damascus and Petra 327.

Congress of Nations, Prize Essay on a, noticed 259.

Coquerel, Athanase, Letter to a Pastor, reviewed 429

Cox, Rev. Samuel H., D. D. on the husks that the swine did eat 112.

Critical Notices 243, 485.

Cross, Marcus E., his Museum of Religious Knowledge, noticed 262.

Church, Christian, history of, by Dr. Burton, noticed 493.

Cutler, Rev. William, history of the Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church, noticed 485.

D.

Daniel and John, designations of time in 35.

Designations of time in Daniel and John 35.—Prof. Stuart's views disputed 35. The 1260 days of Daniel, not literal days, but years 36. Arguments in support of this position 37 seq. Equivalent numbers in the Apocalypse indicate a

specific time 41. Arguments in support of this view 42. The sacred number *seven* often indefinite 44. The church in the wilderness 45. The beast and false prophet 46. Objections to Prof. Stuart's views 47. Consent of commentators 48. The millennium near 49. Encouragement to Christian effort 50. Conclusion 51.

De Gasparin, Count Agénor, letter to M. Athanase Coquerel, reviewed 420.

Dick, Thomas, LL. D., his Sidereal Heavens, noticed 251.

Disordered mental action, imperfect and, by Upham, noticed 252.

E.

Early Christians, piety of 91. Plan of the discussion 92. Their principles in respect to God, his word and Christ 93; in respect to themselves 97; in respect to their brethren 99; in respect to the unconverted 101; their feelings and conduct in the church 103; in business 105; in intercourse and recreations 106; in the family 108. Practical remarks 111.

Ecclesiastical and religious condition of England, observations on the 147.

Education, Domestic, by Dr. Humphrey, noticed 261.

Elton, Prof. Romeo, History of Rhode Island, noticed 496.

Emerson, Prof. R. D. D. his translation of Augustinism and Pelagianism, noticed 247.

England, observations on the ecclesiastical and religious condition of 147. Better knowledge of England desirable 148. England now in a most interesting position 149. British Constitution 150. Old Universities 151. Established church 153. Characteristics of the English people, practical 153. Best scholars devoted to physical science 155. Self-esteem 156. Disposition to disparage what is foreign 157. Three parties at the commencement of the 17th century 161. Decline of religion 162.—Methodism 162. American revolution 163. Condition of the establishment in 1810, 164. Oxford Tracts for the Times 165; writers 166; progress of the new development 167. Isaac Taylor, doctrines of the Tracts 169.

England, history of, by Keightley, noticed 488.

English Literature—Characteristics of 329. The English compared with other languages 329. What is literature? 330. Comprehensiveness 331. Characteristics of the English people 332. A reflecting people 332. Sternness of principle 335. British constitution 336. English history, philosophical 338. Bacon 339. The Englishman a genuine man 340; excels in poetry and fiction 341. His regard for truth 343. Milton 344. Belief in religious truth 344. Proudest eras of English literature 347. Influence of the English Bible 348. English literature a noble inheritance 349; to be studied 350.

Enoch, the Book of, on future punishment 1.

Episcopal Church, history of the missions of, noticed 485.

Essays, Critical and Miscellaneous of T. B. Macauley, noticed 495.

F.

Fatalism and Free Agency 217.

Felton, Prof. C. C., translation of Menzel, noticed 498.

Folsom, Rev. N. S. his Scripture doctrine of Christ and the Holy Spirit, noticed 263.

Fosdick, David Jr., Introduction to the French Language, noticed 500

Free Agency, Fatalism and, Cause and Effect in connection with 217. Power of contrary choice 218. Essence of free moral agency 228. Moral necessity 233.—Great mistake 234. Fatalism 236. Self-denial 241. Practical influence 242.

Same subject continued 467. Self-love not the spring of all voluntary action. Other motives of superior moral worth 469. Reply to "*Inquirer*" 471. Difficulties in mental philosophy 472. Use

of the word *taste* 473. Meaning of "*can*" and "*cannot*" 474. Natural and moral necessity 475. Has the unregenerate man no power to love God? 480.

France, Religious Liberty in 429. Revolution of 1789, 429. Influence of Napoleon 430. Restorer of Religion 431. Author of the Concordat 432. Its provisions 433. Organic Articles 435. Enactments bearing on the Protestants 438. How received 440.—Object of Napoleon 441. Restoration 442. Charter 443. Concordat of 1817, 443. Revolution of 1830, Louis Philippe 445. Opposition to the Protestants 446. Loose legislation 447. Trial of M. Oster 448. Trial of M. Doine, etc. 450. Decision of the Royal Court of Orleans 452 Decision of the Court of Cassation 455. Remarks on 456. Recent plan of the Government 457. The advisers 460. Its reception 461.—Course of the Protestants in future 463. Concluding remarks 463.

French Language, Introduction to, by Fosdick, noticed 500.

Future Punishment, Prof. Stuart on, 1. Why should it be disbelieved? 2. Confident assertion of Universalists 3. Common belief of the Jews in the time of Christ, as indicated by the Book of Enoch 5. That Book denounces the wicked 6;—represents them as suffering 7. The doctrine not dependent on the words *for ever* 9. Why appeal to the Book of Enoch? 10. Object of the appeal 11. Belief in endless punishment general in the primitive age 12 This doctrine not contradicted in the Scriptures 13. Characteristics of Universalists 14. Their attempts at philology 15. Two sects of Universalists 17. Universalists converted on a dying bed 18. Not to be won by argument 19. Doubts occasioned by *a priori* reasoning 20. Such reasoning examined 21. An impressive objection answered 25. Repentance in a future world not taught in Scripture —1 Pet. 3: 18—20 explained 26. Several other passages examined 28. The second death 29. Simple punishment not adapted to produce repentance 33.

G.

General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, history of the Board of Foreign Missions of, noticed 485.

Geology, Scripture and, by John Pye Smith, noticed 258.

Geology, Elementary, by Professor Hitchcock, noticed 497.

German Literature, translation of Menzel, by Felton, noticed 498.

Gnostics, the, philosophy of, 353. Originated among the Eastern Magi 354. Dualism 354. Time of its rise 356. A system of Eclecticism 358. Nature 360. Abyss of being 361. Matter the source of all evil 363. Nicolaitans 364. Cerinthus and Saturninus 365. Bardesanes and Tatian 366. Egyptian Gnostics 367. Basilides 368 Valentinus 371. Orphites or Serpentians 373.—Carpocrates and Gnostics of Asia Minor 373. Marcionites 374.—Conclusions 375.

Greece, History of, by Keightley, noticed 488.

H.

Hall, Rev. Edwin, on Baptism, noticed 502.

Heavens, Architecture of, by Dr. Nichol, noticed 502.

Hebrew Grammar, Dr. Nordheimer's noticed 506.

Hengstenberg, E. W. D. P., D. D. his Christology reviewed 393.—Testimony of the Old Testament to Christ 393. Growth of Prophecy 396. Qualifications of the Author 399. Doubtful explanations 401. Views of Prophecy 403.—Particular passages 403. Symbolical action of the prophets 405.

Hitchcock, Prof. Edward, Elementary Geology, noticed 264 and 497.

Hill, Rev. W. D. D. history of Presbyterianism, noticed 504.

Humphrey, Rev. H. D. D. his Domestic Education, noticed 261.

Husks that the swine did eat 112.

Specimen described 113. Authorities for its identity 114.

I.

"*Inquirer*," reply to, by Dr. Woods 467.

J.

Jewish religion, present state of, concluded 176. Feast of Tabernacles 176. Pouring of water in golden cups 177. Profane days of the feast 178. This feast at Safed 179. Synagogue services at Bagdad and Beyroot 181.—Feast of dedication 182. Feast of Esther 182. Sabbath 183. Prayers 184. Education confined to males 186. Mode of education prescribed in the Talmud 186. Marriage 188. Colleges in Palestine 189. Obeisance to the Moon 191. Jews in Palestine compared with those in Russia, Poland and Turkey 193. Praying for souls in purgatory 195 Cruelties 197. Modern Judaism offspring of the Talmud 200. Note by the editor 201.

John, Daniel and, designations of time in 35.

John the Evangelist, life and character of, 299. Parentage and early religious impressions 299. First appearance as a disciple 300. Residence in Asia Minor 302. Anecdote 303. Delicate susceptibility 304. Ardency of temperament 306. Profound views 309.

Jordan, the, and its Valley, by Dr. Robinson 265. Introductory note by the editors 265. Northwestern coast of the Dead Sea 266. Aspect of the country 267. Banks of the Jordan 267. Breadth 268.—Upper banks 268. Early travellers to the Jordan 269. Burckhardt's account of the Ghor, 270. Biblical account 273. Periodical rise 274. Causes 275. Passage of the Israelites 276.

K.

Keightley, Thos. Histories of Greece, Rome and England, noticed 488.

Keith, Prof. Reuel, D. D. his translation of Hengstenberg's Christology, reviewed 393.

Kirk, Rev. Edward N. his Sermons noticed 262.

Kurtz, Rev. Benjamin, D. D. on Baptism, noticed 503.

L.

Landis, Rev. R. W. reply to Alex. Campbell 203.

Letters from the Old World, by a Lady of New-York, noticed 263.

Lindsley Rev. Philip, D. D. on the primitive state of mankind 277.

Literature, English, characteristics of 329

Lutteroth, Henri, Letters to a Pastor, reviewed 429.

M.

Mack, Rev. Enoch, history of the Freewill Baptist Foreign Mission Society, noticed 485.

Mahan, Rev. Asa, on Christian Perfection, 408.

Macauley, Thomas Babington, Critical and Miscellaneous Essays, noticed 495.

Manner in the preacher 78. What is meant by manner 78. Strength of voice, pleasantness, gesture 79. Naturalness and earnestness 80. Importance of a good manner 81. Secures a good field and auditory 83. Helps to a hearing 84. Augments the force of matter 85. How much is attainable in respect to manner 86. Difficulties stated 87. May be overcome 88. Obligation to cultivate 89.

Martin-Paschoud, Joseph, Letter to Count De Gasparin, reviewed 420.

Medical and Physiological Commentaries, by Dr. Paine, noticed 491.

Mellen, Grenville, on the influence of poetry on the age 116.

Menzel, Wolfgang, translation of, by Prof. Felton, noticed 498.

Methodist Episcopal Church, history of the missios of, noticed 485.

Milne, Rev. William, D. D. Life and opinions, by Philip, noticed 256.

Missionary enterprise, the, aspect

and position of, in the Oriental world 54. Indications of a universal dispensation of mercy to the world 55. Chance excluded 56. God's providence to be interpreted with caution 57. All human revolutions connected with the cross of Christ 58. Spirituality necessary to understand either Providence or prophecy 60. This world the laboratory of truth 62. Human revolutions result from human passions 63. Great practical truths slowly learned 64. General lessons, the history of the church a history of experiments 65. The Romish hierarchy 66. The causes of its corruption 67. The work of missions reserved for Protestants 67. The new world discovered 68. The church in New England, the French Revolution 69. Knowledge increased 70. Facilities of communication 71. Concentration of interest upon the Oriental world 72. The struggle one of intense interest 73. Egypt 73. Missionary operations 74. The Scriptures illustrated 75. England and America have taken the lead 76. But one thing lacking 77.

Missions, American history of, noticed 485.

Murray, Hugh, history of British America, noticed 505.

Mudge, Rev. Enoch, history of the missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church, noticed 485.

N.

Nichol, Prof. J. P., L. L. D. Architecture of the heavens, noticed 502.

Nordheimer's Heb. Grammar, noticed 506.

O.

Old World, Letters from the, noticed 263.

Oriental world, aspect and position of the missionary enterprise in the, 54

Oxford Tracts, Ancient Christianity and, by Taylor, noticed 248.

P.

Packard, Prof. J. Review of Hengstenberg's Christology 393.

Paine, Martyn, M. D Medical and Physiological Commentaries, noticed 491.

Payne, George, LL. D. letter to the Editor noticed 506.

Peck, Rev. Solomon, history of the missions of the Baptist Gen. Convention, noticed 485.

Pelagianism, Augustinism and, by Wiggers, noticed 247.

Perfection, Christian, the doctrine of, by Pres. Mahan 408. Note by the editors 408. Reply to Mr. Folsom 409. Arguments in support of the doctrine 411. Promises 412. Obligations and authorized prayers 414. Condition of the promises 416. Language of the Bible and church contrasted 417. Safety of the doctrine 418. Consequences of the opposite belief 419. Bible affirms the perfect holiness of some 420. Paul 420. John 422. Bible affirms that the church shall attain to this state 423. Promised 424. Difficulties of the opposite theory 426.

Philip, Rev. Robert, his Life and Opinions of Milne, noticed 256.

Physiological, Medical and, Commentaries by Dr. Paine, noticed 491.

Piety of the early Christians 91.

Poetry, its influence on the age 116. Poets and poetry in the earliest times 117; in modern times 119. Schools of poetry 120. True standard of poetry 121. Simplicity 122. Important change in poetic style 123. Influence of public opinion on poetry 124; of criticism 125. True pathos 128. Poetry for the people 129. Style adapted to the age 130. Higher range of poetry 131. Extreme simplicity 132. The drama 134. Mysteries and moralities 135. Influence of Christianity 136. Greek tragedy 139. Roman tragedy 141. Drama in Spain 142; in France 143. Influence of criticism 144. Principles of poetry imperishable 145.

Poet's Tribute the, by Tappan, noticed 261.
Porter, Rev. N. Jr. on the characteristics of English Literature 329.
Preacher, Manner in the 78.
Presbyterianism, history of, by Dr. Hill, noticed 504.
Primitive State of Mankind, by Dr. Lindsley 277. Civilized and not savage 277. Opposite theory prevalent 278. But false 279. Arguments from reason 279. Ancient writers 280. Monboddo 283. Beattie 286. Speech not invented 287. Blair 288. Scripture 289. Adam an eminent naturalist 289. Cain, Enoch, Lamech 290. Longevity 290. Immense population, unity of language 291. Great fertility 292. State of the arts 293. The ark 294. Noah and his family 295. Tower of Babel 296. Confusion of tongues 297.
Psychology, by Dr. Rauch 243.
Punishment, future, Prof. Stuart on, 1.

R.

Rauch, Pres. F. A. his Psychology, noticed 243.
Religious Knowledge, the Museum of, by Cross, noticed 262.
Religious Liberty in France 429.
Review of Hengstenberg's Christology 393.
Rhode Island, History of, noticed 496.
Robinson, Prof. Edward, D. D., on the Jordan and its valley 265.
Rome, history of, by Keightley, noticed, 488.

S.

Salisbury, Edward E., on the Apostle John 299.
Scotland and the Scotch, noticed 259.
Scripture and Geology, by John Pye Smith, noticed 258.
Sermons on different subjects, by Kirk, noticed 262.
Shepard, Rev. Prof. Geo., on manner in the preacher 78.
Sidereal Heavens, the, by Dick, noticed 251.
Sinclair, Catherine, her Scotland and the Scotch, noticed 259.
Smith, Fitzhugh, a tribute to the memory of, noticed 260.
Smith, John Pye, D. D. his Scripture and Geology, noticed 258.
Southgate, Rev. Henry, his Travels, noticed 257.
Stowe, Prof. C. E., D. D., on the piety of the early Christians 91.
Stuart, Prof. M. on future punishment 1.

T.

Tappan, William B. his Poet's Tribute, noticed 261.
Tappan, Prof. Henry P. his Doctrine of the Will, noticed 253.
Taylor, Isaac, his Ancient Christianity and the Oxford Tracts, noticed 248
Tour, Narrative of a, through Armenia, etc., by Southgate 257.
Tracy, Rev. Joseph, history of the Am. Board of Com. for Foreign Missions, noticed 485; history of the Board of Foreign Missions of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, noticed 485.

U.

Upham, Prof. Thomas C. his outlines of imperfect and disordered mental action, noticed 252.

W.

Wiggers, G. F. D. D., his Augustinism and Pelagianism, by Emerson, noticed 247.
Will, Doctrine of, by Tappan, noticed 253.
Will, Essay on the power of, 378. Note by the editors 378 Volitions generic and specific 380. Laws of association 381. Mind in a state of indecision 382. Influence of generic volitions 383. Ruling passion 384. How decided 385. Examples 386. Instinctive benevolence 386. Howard 387 His maxims 389. Influence of rational benevolence 390. Vindictive emotions 390. Selfishness, ambition, etc. 391.
Woods, Rev. Leonard, D. D. on Cause and Effect in connection with Fatalism and Free Agency 217. Same subject continued and reply to "Inquirer," 467.

BENJAMIN KURTZ,

Baltimore.

BLOUGH-WEIS LIBRARY
DOES NOT
CIRCULATE
ARCHIVES
SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY

3 4998 0027 9753 3
SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY